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Chapter I

Introduction

Introduction to the background and relevance of the research question.

All living things, singly or in groups, are dependent upon factors outside themselves for their survival. "No man is an island" aptly describes the physiological and/or psychological dependencies all living things experience. What one depends upon is related to the organism's design and process of function. A green plant, whose goal is survival and reproduction, is designed to produce its own food supply but is dependent upon ingredients outside itself to achieve this designed end result. Remove light or water and the plant will cease to survive or will try to adapt to its changed environment by growing longer roots or broader leaves.

Survival is contingent upon recognizing the sources of dependency in the environment, negotiating with that environment to maintain the supply of needed resources or being able to adapt to changes in the environment which alter the supply of those resources. Failure to accomplish any one of the three can result in a real threat to the continued survival of the organization.

United States public educational organizations, K-12, are experiencing a growth in external demands and pressures which can impact upon the structure and function of the organization. The traditional "logic of confidence" (Meyer and Rowan, 1978) providing the means for educa-
tional organizations' loose coupling phenomena (March & Olsen, 1976, Weick, 1976) allowing for adaptation of structure without direct effect upon activity, is perhaps even being eroded as state legislators enact legislation directed at specific activity. (California's Stull Act, Florida's Competency Legislation) Further research is needed to explore the long range effects of such legislation on structure, but the increase in "outside" intervention in the public schools places increased demands on the focal organizations' ability to obtain goals, maintain autonomy and survive.

The sources of external demands on public schools range from local interest groups to national lobbies to state and federal legislators, and courts. The measurable effects of these environmental pressures vary: failed levies (Ohio, Oregon); school closings (Ohio, Oregon); mandated curriculum (New York, Florida, Maryland, etc.) declining enrollment; competency testing, legislated standards for special groups (exceptional children, minorities, women).

Public schools have traditionally taken a reactive stance to the myriad demands with which they have been bombarded. (Tyack: 1974) Schools have been good adapters, excluding or coopting those groups with enough power potentially to affect the system.

Liaison groups on the local, state and federal level have been organized in reaction to external demands. The formation of Parent-Teacher Organizations, blue ribbon commissions, community advisory groups, library councils, curriculum review committees, are examples of the organization's attempt to coopt potentially divisive outsiders.

But public school administrators have not been effective in their analysis of power, who holds it and why, and how dependency relationships
with factors in the environment can threaten internal decision making and goal attainment.

To enable a better understanding of public educational organizations' reactive stance to environmental demands, we need to examine more closely the unique make-up of public K-12 educational organizations and their environments, perceived and actual.

An organization is made up of people working toward a common or interacting outcome; it is viable, enduring, bounded by space and time. (Schein, 1972) Conceptually, organizations exist at all levels in society. Their differences in size, shape, structure, goals, personnel, context, design, are contrasted with their unique similarity, all organizations have a purpose, there is some reason for their existence. These purposes range from a temporary organization, described by Thompson (1967) as forming in reaction to an emergency or crisis, to an organization created to serve a specific function over time.

Educational organizations, characterized as organized anarchies with ambiguous goals, unsure technology and shifting boundaries, (March & Olson, 1976), are expected to perform a particular function for American society. American schools initially served the requirements of an elite group and expanded into a socializing and regulatory agency for the masses controlled by the elite. (Tyack, 1974) In today's complex turbulent society, schools are no longer expected to merely Americanize students and provide them with the basic tools of learning. Schools are not designed nor maintained to merely meet individual and varying needs of students and families. They have become "the credentialing agency of modern society" (Meyer & Rowan, 1978) and are thus subject to myriad
expectations and demands. Each level of a school system, its clients: students, owners-managers: administration - school board, rank and file: faculty and public at large: American society - local and national, (Blau & Scott, 1962) view the school system from a different perspective - reflecting a variance of norms and goals in their expectations of schools.

Thus, public education is in a relatively unique position, it is open to the demands and dreams of a pluralistic society who have all personally experienced either the process or product of educational organizations.

This permeability of boundary allows the organizations's "customers" access not only to the output or product of the organization which they can accept or reject, but allows access to the organization's inputs and means of production, its "technology." Depending on situational variances, an irate parent who screams loudly enough, a special interest group, a state or local legislative body, a grassroots movement, a national organization, can directly affect the structure, policies, and perhaps even the day to day activities within one school, a school district, county system or state system. Contrast the openness of public schools with another service organization or commercial organizations. A hospital, serving the health needs of a designated population, does not allow public access to its procedures, policies or operations. Its "core technology," the judgment and actions of physicians and health personnel, is highly buffered through the creation of myths and barbedwired legal blockages. A commercial organization, an automobile manufacturer, contends with opinions and attitudes of its potential customers through its marketing division. It does not allow its customers access to its policy making, determination
of inputs or assessment of its technological modes of operation.

Public educational organizations are bombarded with opinions, demands and desires from a variety of sources; to whom or what then does the educational organization pay attention?

Weick (1969:64) describes an "enacted environment," "...the human creates the environment to which the system then adapts." Meaning is given to events after they have occurred, "The creation of meaning is an attentional process, but it is attention to that which has already occurred, whatever is occurring at the moment will influence what the person discovers when he (sic) glances backward." (Weick, 1969:65) An organization's environment is enacted through the process of attention, those parts of the environment paid attention to thus become the working environment of the organization. Similarly, Dill's (1962) analysis examines an organization's environment through the information it seeks and the information made available to it. The organization responds to what it believes to be its environment, its judgment colored by previous events. An organization's inability to plan for and cope with change may be a product of an inaccurate picture of its own reality; a reality determined by the collectors and processors of information; or a reality which once existed but has evolved into something very different. Stinchcombe (1965) contends an organization retains the structures, norms of behavior, and operations developed and influenced by the conditions in existence when the organization was first conceived, then born. Even though, as an organization exists over time, environmental conditions may change, the organization tends to follow its genetic memory. Adaptation to change, or perception of change, is not necessarily an inherited trait of organizations.
Pfeffer & Salancik (1978:89) examine some of the problems in environmental enactment, perhaps shedding light on why public schools, although responding to environmental pressures and demands, are confronting unforeseen problems threatening their survival.

"Organizations may misread interdependence, misinterpret demands, remain committed to past practices, or fail to see the various conflicts in demands."

"...the effective organization is one which responds to the demands from its environment according to its dependence on the various components of the environment." (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978:84)

This process of responding to "necessary" demands presupposes the recognition by the organization of an environment and its potential to the survival of the focal organization.

Proponents of long-term environmental forecasting aptly describe this relationship: "Any organization is a creature of its environment. Its resources, its problems, its opportunities, and its very survival are generated and conditioned by the environment." (Subhash and Singhoi, 50:1977) In defining the environment as political, economic technological and social, Subhash and Singhoi illustrate the influences of the environment on the organization: (53:1977)

Influence of Environment on Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Trends</th>
<th>Direct Influence of Environment</th>
<th>Non-Profit Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members Current &amp; Potential</td>
<td>Direct Influence of Environment</td>
<td>New Objectives &amp; Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing Institutions</td>
<td>Indirect Influence of Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And yet, organizations are not solely reactive to their environment; they do have the capability of influencing and changing their environment. Environmental scanning, the process of analyzing the environment as an ongoing process to reduce complexity and uncertainty, generates information on how the environment may best be influenced to meet the needs of the organization. (Terry, 2-3:1977)

Little attention has been paid to the identification and assessment of public educational organizations' environments. The majority of research has examined community power in relation to school boards and superintendents. (McCarthy, 1971) This body of literature proceeds from a categorizing prospective, matching the types and nature of community groups to the composition and characteristics of boards and superintendents. It does not provide an adequate assessment of who or what makes up the environment in which public schools must function and survive. It does not offer the tools to begin describing components of that environment and analyzing these groups or individuals in terms of what resources they hold and what can be done to obtain these resources without relinquishing too much power (decision making).

We must look to the literature on organizations and seek out and apply models that afford this type of analysis. Educational organizations will benefit from searching out their task environment, identifying requisite resources, developing strategies intended to reduce uncertainty and dependence, sloughing off the blinders of an enacted environment, and discarding the myths of place and function of educational organizations.

Educational organizations have been characterized as unique systems able to adapt structurally to multiple demands while leaving actual
classroom activity relatively unaffected. (Meyer and Rowan, 1978: Weick, 1976: Bidwell, 1965) But what is the cost of structural change in reaction to environmental demands? What is the cost of court mandated integration, teacher strikes, failed levies, competency tests, mandated curriculum? Why is it that public schools have developed reactive mechanisms which allow for survival, but do nothing to prevent the recochtening of these organizations from "crisis" to "crisis." (Cremin, 1964)

"...organizations cannot survive by responding completely to every environmental demand. The interesting issue then becomes the extent to which organizations can and should respond to various environmental demands." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:43)

Public school administrators face demands and pressures from all levels in their environment: federal, state, and local. Educational organizations, as with all organizations, are open systems seeking closure.

The "ideal" of a closed system, is a system independent of all others, able to exist without interactions, certain of its inputs and acceptance of outputs, with control over goal setting and decision making, the creator of its own environment. "A new tradition enables us to conceive of the organization as an open system, indeterminate and faced with uncertainty, but subject to criteria of rationality and hence needing certainty." (Thompson, 1967:13)

An open system must contend with environmental uncertainty and dependence upon outside factors for needed resources; an effective organization attempts to reduce the uncertainty and dependence while maintaining control of decision making. How successful an organization
is at doing this somewhat determines its ability to survive in its known form.

As stated previously, public educational organizations are systems with unique characteristics, whose top management, superintendents, are either elected by the school district's registered voters, or appointed by a school board who are themselves elected. The majority of school superintendents are not trained per se for the position. Although they take specialized courses to obtain certification, most superintendents have progressed up through the ranks from classroom teacher to some sort of administrative position, (principal, assistant superintendent) to the central office. According to the AASA Survey of Superintendents (1970), only 12.5% of superintendents had earned doctorate degrees in educational administration or related educational fields. In a recent indepth study done on twenty superintendents in Ohio, Ogawa (1979) found that the majority of superintendents perceived the most important part of their training to be "on the job" and their formal training was accomplished part-time.

Superintendent's orientation to the school system's environment and perception of who or what in that environment is necessary to the system's survival may be somewhat shaped by their long experience within the system. "Organizational perception and knowledge of the environment is also affected because individuals who attend to the information occupy certain positions in the organization and tend to define the information as a function of their position." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:13)

The intent of this study is threefold: one, to find out who or what in the environment superintendents consider to be most important to the
school system's survival. The second intent is to develop an approach to identifying school system's task environment and sources of dependency. The third is to compare these findings with the perceptions of the superintendents.

Thus, the Problem Statement: The investigator in this study intends to identify the resource-dependence between prototype public schools in Ohio and their task environments, based on a number of theoretical models, and compare these with the perceptions of a discrete sample of superintendents.

The proposed study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

The first objective is to develop a typology of public educational organizations in Ohio based on a modified definition of Levine and White's model of an organization's domain.

The second is to identify groups or organizations in the task environment relevant to the functioning of each identified categorized school system. Relevancy will be defined in terms of the holding or control of requisite resources of the focal organization based on Pfeffer & Salancik's (1978) resource-dependency model. The major sectors of the task environment to be used in this study are identified by Dill (1962) as: customers, suppliers, competitors, and regulatory agencies.

The third objective is to identify sources of dependency based on the application of Pfeffer & Salancik's resource-dependence model.

The fourth objective is to compare the categorized school systems and their task environments with their passage or nonpassage of school levies.

The fifth objective is to compare the results of the theoretical model to the perceptions of a discrete sample of superintendents in Ohio.
The final objective is to raise further research questions based on the findings of this study.

In the process of developing a typology of educational organizations in the state of Ohio and applying Pfeffer's model of resource dependence, the investigator hopes to answer the following types of questions:

1. What elements comprise the public school's domain?
2. How does the domain differ for different types of school districts in Ohio?
3. What elements comprise the task environments of Ohio public schools?
4. How does the task environment differ for different types of school districts in Ohio?
5. For what resources are the school districts dependent upon in their task environment?
6. What type of resource dependence is created between a school district's domain and its task environment?
7. Are there any commonalities, regarding levy passage, among school districts with a similar domain and task environment?
8. How do a number of Ohio superintendents define their organization's task environment and identify resources needed for survival?

Definitions of Terms

Since many of the terms and concepts used in this study were developed in a variety of disciplines, a listing of definitions should facilitate common understandings.

1. Domain - "The domain of an organization consists of the specific goals it wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals." (Levine and White, 1961:597) The domain
of an organization can be conceptualized in terms of: 1) the population it serves, 2) the services it provides, 3) the range of products offered, and 4) its location.

2. Task Environment - "...those inputs which bear potentially on goal setting and on goal attainment within the organization." (Dill, 1962:96). Dill has characterized those elements as the organization's customers, suppliers of resources, competition, and regulators.

3. Resource - a source of supply or support needed by an organization (inputs) for effective functioning. "The key to organizational survival is the ability to acquire and maintain resources." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:2)

4. Dependency - reliance upon created through the import of resources from an organization's environment. "...an organization is dependent on elements of its task environment: 1) in proportion to the organization's need for resources or performances which that element can provide, and 2) in inverse proportion to the ability of other elements to provide the same resource or performance." (Thompson, 1967:30)

5. Interdependency - condition created in social systems when "one actor does not entirely control all of the conditions necessary for the achievement of an action or for obtaining the outcome desired from the action. (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:40)

6. Uncertainty - condition created by cause and effect relationships being unknown. "Uncertainties are presented to complex organizations from two sources...External uncertainties stem from 1) generalized uncertainty, or lack of cause/effect understanding in the culture at
large, and 2) contingency in which the outcomes of organizational action are in part determined by the actions of elements of the environment." (Thompson, 1967:159)

7. Population - those individuals and/or groups served by the organization as defined by the organization's goals and/or accepted or expected by the norms of society.

8. Product - the output of an organization.

9. Services - beneficial or helpful set of activities.

10. Customers - groups or individuals to whom the outputs of an organization are offered.

11. Suppliers - sources of raw materials, resources, services required by the organization as inputs.

12. Competitors - 1) organizations which operate in similar markets offering a similar product (compete for customers), 2) organizations which utilize similar inputs (compete for resources).

13. Regulators - any body or institution with the sanctioned power and/or authority to impose constraints on the operation of the organization.

14. Society - "The total culture in which the organization exists and from which is brought into the organization the values, norms and goals which influence organizations..." (Terry, 1977:8)

Assumptions

To conduct this study, it was necessary to make the following assumptions:

1. The sample of superintendents who provided information on the written questionnaire is representative of the total population of
school superintendents, although the sampling procedure utilized cannot be statistically verified on a national level.

2. The sample of superintendents who served as interview subjects is representative of the total population of school superintendents.

3. The superintendents responses reflect their actual perceptions and attitudes.

4. The questions to which superintendents responded did focus upon their perceptions of the organization's environment and the elements which compose the organization's domain.

5. The task environment of an organization can be identified through analysis of its domain and characteristics of its environment.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study are threefold:

1. Theoretical Framework

2. Generalization

3. Data Collection Pitfalls

The categorization of Ohio School Systems and description of their task environments are limited by the theoretical constructs used to frame the data collection. That is, the answers received are to an extent limited by the questions asked. Using Levine and White's model of organization's domain focuses the study on their specific characterizations of domain and limits the inclusion of other factors and characterizations.

Caution must be used in generalizing results from this study to school systems in other states. Questions for further investigation or research will be generated from this study, no attempts will be made to
generalize to similar situations or systems in other states.

All social research techniques are subject to limitations. Perceptual distortion, modification of experience through hindsight, inadequacies of our sense-organs, the interdependence of observation with inference, untruthful responses to questions, (Madge, 1953), are all problems with which the researcher must contend.
Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

Organizations have been created from the beginning of human beings existence on earth. Whatever definition of organization one accepts from the proliferous field of choice, organizations appear to be made up of identifiable groups of people who create patterns of interactions and communication directed toward some goals. (Simon, 1976)

The early cave dwellers thus created organization in their attempt to survive. The feudal lord developed a complex organization to provide for the maintenance of a particular lifestyle. The Russian Czars maintained an organization designed to insulate their power and position. And the founders of General Motors built an organization to provide the means to increase their wealth.

Early organizational theorists focused their attention on the organization itself. They described, prescribed and created theoretical organizational designs based on theory, conjecture, prescription and some research. The resulting models cluster under the umbrella of the machine model, based on the assumption that organizations can be rationally designed to meet specific goals and outcomes. These early theorists prescribed specific structures to facilitate the meeting of organizational goals. Weber's bureaucratic model, Fayol's administrative management and Taylor's time-study model all prescribe "one best way" to structure and
operationalize an organization toward goal fulfillment. The focus of these models is on the organization exclusive of its contextual setting, its environment. Machine theory views the organization as a closed system, independent of other systems, which can rationally plan and operationalize its structures to meet its predetermined goals.

The organization was viewed as an insular entity devoid of a setting, a history, and interrelationships with other organizations. The cave dweller, the feudal lord, the czar and General Motors could best attain their goals through rational design. Unexpected outcomes: a drought, a peasant uprising, a decline in car sales, are viewed as results of ignorance or error.

"For the first half of this century, managerial and organization theorists tended to ignore the environment, or at least to hold it constant, as they sought universalistic principles of structure, planning, control and the like.

Economists, of course, were concerned with organizational adjustments to the environment, but by and large these were treated simply as formal exercises in profit-maximizing logic." (Miles, Snow, and Pfeffer, 1974:245)

As the study of organizations continued theorists began to broaden their scope of focus and looked at organizations as they interrelated with others in a network of system.

The universalistic principles of organization and management were questioned in light of the seemed inability of bureaucracies to adjust to environmental changes and adapt to individual needs. Gouldner's (1954) case study suggested the effectiveness of bureaucracy in one context and its damaging effects in another. Burns and Stalker extended the concept of organizational structure being contingent upon external factors.

Through the late 50's and 60's theorists developed an intricate
series of models depicting the linkages among the environment, technology, structure and process, although most dealt with only a limited aspect of the full adjustment sequence. (Miles, Snow, and Pfieffer, 1974) The organic or systems models grew from the structural-functional concept of organization (Parsons, 1960; Barnard, 1955) which developed from von Bertanffly's notion of viewing organizations as organic systems, adapting and evolving with the changes in its environment to survive. Organizations are described as flexible, dynamic systems struggling to maintain and meet their needs for survival as they relate to the whole system. (Parsons, Selznick, Compt) Each subsystem is linked and interdependent producing output which becomes the input for other subsystems returning energetic inputs to the original (Katz and Kahn, 1966). Starbuck (1965) related defining an organization's boundary to that of finding the boundary of a cloud, since organizations are constantly changing and their boundaries fluctuate accordingly.

Organization and structure are not products of pure rational thought but reflect the need of organizations to respond and adapt to change. The organization is not an omnipotent unit controlling all variables but is one part, a subunit of a larger organization or system. It has a location, is subject to societal norms and laws, it is dependent on sources outside its boundaries for resources (inputs) and acceptance of its outputs, and is subject to forces, changes, unknowns, beyond its control or prediction.

The term environment does not connote a precise meaning; thus, theorists have attempted to pin down the characteristics of environment as it relates to organizations.
Dill (1958:410) defines an organization's task environment as those parts of the environment, "...relevant or potentially relevant to goal attainment."

Osborn and Hunt (1974:232) restrict the task environment to other organizations, "specifically the task environment of a given organization consists of all of those organizations with which it must interact to grow and survive."

Porter, et. al., (1975:227) defines an organization's operating environment as "...the set of conditions outside the organization that have a direct impact on the day-to-day functioning of the organization." Thompson's (1967:27) task environment are "...those parts of the environment relevant to goal setting and goal attainment." Penning's (1975) definition includes the set of persons, groups and organizations with which the focal organization has exchange relations.

Emery and Trist (1963) describe four idealized types of environments identifying the demands each type of environment places upon the organization. The organization, and the organization set (Evans, 1966) were recognized as components of a larger social context. In the placid-random environment single organizations are dependent upon resources randomly distributed. Survival depends upon the ability to use and store a single resource, use a plentiful resource or make use of a variety of resources.

Competitive interdependence characterizes the disturbed-reactive environment. Organizations within the same environment compete for resources and interact with each other. Survival in this environment depends upon the ability to recognize the interdependencies and to pre-
dict the transactions of competitors. In the final environment, 
turbulent, organizations in one environment are interconnected with 
other sets of interdependent organizations.

Terreberry (1968) found these four stages to be part of an evolu-
tionary process with environments becoming more turbulent.

In his study of social service networks, Turk (1970) found positive 
benefits to an organization which was part of an interorganizational 
network.

Katz and Kahn (1966) identify five dimensions of the environment 
in which all organizations must function.

Evan's (1976) "organization set" describes the interrelationship 
between a focal organization, other organizations and the values, norms 
and culture of the existing society.

Osborn and Hunt (1974:234) identify the elements of the environment 
on two levels. The macro environment is the general cultural context of 
a specified geographical area which contains forces that have an influence 
on the organization's characteristics and outputs. Schein (1965) defines 
these forces as economic, educational, legal-political and social cultural. 
Terry (1977) groups these forces in terms of the organization's market 
influences (customers, competitors), technical influences (raw materials, 
knowledge, processes), social influences (values, constraints, attitudes) 
and political influences (government, state).

The aggregation environment (Osborn and Hunt, 1974:234) is composed 
of the associations, interest groups and constituencies within a given 
macro environment. Taylor (1968) identifies occupational affiliation as 
an important factor in this environment, while Perrow (1972) identifies
politically centered collections as potentially dominant.

Pfeffer and Salancik (1978:63) distinguish three levels of the environment.

"On one level, the environment consists of the entire system of interconnected individuals and organizations who are related to one another and to a focal organization through the organization's transactions. The next level is the set of individuals and organizations with whom this organization directly interacts. It is on this level that the organization can experience its environment. The environment comprised of organizations transacting with the focal organization is, however, not the environment that determines organizational action, for this environment, in order to affect action, must be observed and registered. Observation, attention, and perception are active processes which must occur for events to exist in the experience of any social actor. Thus, the third level of the organization's environment can be characterized as the level of the organization's perception and representation of the environment - its enacted environment."

Many of the early natural system theorists view the environment as making up the organization's suprasystem. Barnard's (1938) definition of organization incorporates the concept of organizations as systems of cooperation. In explaining the paradox between a rationally designed formal organization functioning in an "institutional matrix," Selznick (1949) identifies the adjustment needed of the formal system and social structure to the "pressures of the institution's environment." Parsons (1960) structural functional analysis describes the relationship between organizations and society in terms of the politics, social institutions and culture in which it exists.

The more recent proponents of long range planning describe the components of most current organization environments as turbulent and uncertain, less autonomous and composed of other formal organizations. Terry (1977:2) defines the environment as consisting of
"those things which lie outside of the company and are of concern to it. Things which have influence on the organization and things which the organization wishes to influence. The environment is the prime determinant of the form and behavior of an organization."

Varied studies show the causal relationship between characteristics of the environment and such variables as: the autonomy of top-level managers (Dill, 1958), managerial perceptions of uncertainty (Duncan, 1971), management's approach to goal attainment (Negand and Reimann, 1972) and goals set by the organization (Simpson and Gully, 1962).

As research of organization structure led to the development of structure-contingency models (Pennings, 1975) the nature of an organization's environment was explored as one of the contextual factors upon which organization structure is contingent. (Other factors: size, Pugh et al. 1969; Blau, 1970; human resources, Hall, 1968, Straus, 1963; societal role, Blau & Scott, 1962; technology, Woodward, 1965, Hickson, et al., 1969, Thompson, 1967). Although recent reviews of literature raise questions about the one dimensional causal relationship between structure and context (Kimberly, 1976; Ford and Slocum, 1977, Tosi, 1973; Child, 1972); the exploration of the organization environment in relation to other factors contributed to the development of the field and the recognition of environmental significance.

It is generally accepted that as the environment becomes more complex, the organization must adjust internal structure and processes to maintain and/or increase effectiveness. Osborn and Hunt (1974) characterize environmental complexity as the interaction effect among the three variables of risk, dependency and interorganizational relationships.

Risk may be conceptualized in terms of change. Lawrence and Lorsch
(1967) Terreberry (1968) and Bennis (1966) found change involves a dynamic newly created set of circumstances with which the organization cannot adapt until it can estimate the direction of change and the developing form of consistency. Often an organization will continue operating in a manner which no longer serves a functional purpose due to an inability to perceive change or adapt to it. (Bennis, 1966)

Dependency is "the degree to which a system relies upon specific elements in the environment for growth and survival and the extent to which these important environmental elements affect each other." (Osborn and Hunt, 1974:235) Thompson (1967) found as an organization's environment becomes more heterogeneous it increases the number of constraints (dependencies) to the organization, which demands a greater variety of functional skills and divisions in response. As the environment becomes more dynamic it increases the number of contingencies (risks) facing the organization, which makes the management of the task environment more difficult and often leads to a high degree of centralization.

Terreberry (1968) and Emery and Trist (1965) found the combination of increasing risk and dependency has an adverse effect on organization.

The third characteristic of a complex environment, interorganizational interaction, is best described by Evans (1963). To survive, each system must exchange values with the environment. The level and nature of the exchange relationship is dependent upon organizational and environmental conditions and most likely influenced by the amount of risk and dependency in the environment.
"The work of Burns and Stalker, Emery and Trist, Lawrence and Lorsch indicates as segments of the environment become more dynamic, the organization must become not only more receptive to change, but alter its internal structure and operations to maintain and/or establish a high survival potential." (Osborn and Hunt, 1974:235)

The Lawrence and Lorsch Study, (1967:157), of the degree and type of organizational differentiation, integration and nature of the environment reaches the conclusion that departments in effective organizations reflect the characteristics of its respective environment. "...if an organization's internal states and processes are consistent with external demands, the findings of this study suggest it will be effective."

Emery and Trist (1963) identify stability/instability and complexity/simplicity as environmental variables correlated with organizational design. Their typology is based on the degree of interconnectedness and the extent of change in the environment.

Burns and Stalker (1961) identify management systems (mechanistic, organic) characteristic of stable or changing environments.

Terreberry (1968) describes the evolution of formal organizations commensurate with the evolution of the environment from placid-clustered to turbulent.

Crozier (1964) identifies a correlation between a turbulent environment and increase in internal controls. Corwin (1977) describes this phenomena as curvilinear dependent upon the organization's initial relationship with its environment.

Bennis and Slater (1968) find organizations in a turbulent environment creating temporary task forces.

As the study of organizational adaptation to the environment developed theorists branched in their research focus. Etzioni (1960)
outlines three perspectives from which the interaction between the organization and external units can be studied: 1) the interrelations among organizations, 2) the relations of political forms of society to various organizations, 3) the interchange between organizations and external collectivities.

Miles, Snow and Pfeffer (1974:246) identify four intertwined decision points upon which the majority of research has focused: 1) decisions by which the organization selects a portion of the total environment as its particular arena of activity (domain) and chooses a basic strategy for managing the domain, 2) decisions by which the organization establishes an appropriate technology for implementing basic operating strategy, 3) decisions by which the organization creates a structure of roles and relationships to control and coordinate the technology and strategy, and 4) decisions made to assure the organization's capacity to survive, adjust and grow.

Although these decision areas are interrelated, our main area of interest is with the first as explained in Chapter One. An organization creates its domain through defining the activities it intends to pursue. In so doing, the organization creates interdependencies with elements of its task environment. For the purposes of this study we will adopt the concept of task environment developed by Dill (1958) in his study of two Norwegian firms. He found the task environment to be composed of: 1) customers, including distributors and users, 2) suppliers of materials, labor, capital, 3) competitors for both markets and resources, and 4) regulatory groups, public and private.

Levine and White (1971) in their study of health agencies in a
community identify the carving out of domain through enactment of goals and the resulting interdependencies with the task environment created by the scarcity of requisite elements.

"In order to achieve its specific objectives, however, an agency must possess or control certain elements. It must have clients to serve; it must have resources in the form of equipment, specialized knowledge, or the funds with which to procure them, and it must have the services of people who can direct those resources to the clients." (Levine and White, 1961:586)

"In sum, organizational goals or objectives may be viewed as defining the organization's ideal need for elements - consumers, labor services and other resources. The scarcity of elements, however, impels the organization to restrict its activity to limited specific functions. The fulfillment of those limited functions, in turn, requires access to certain kinds of elements, which an organization seeks to obtain by entering into exchanges with other organizations." (Levine and White, 1961:587)

The domain of an organization consists of the specific goals it wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to implement its goals. The goals of the organization constitute in effect the organization's claim to future functions and to the elements requisite to those functions, whereas the present or actual functions carried out by the organization constitute de facto claims to these elements. Exchange agreements rest upon prior consensus regarding domain.

Organizational domain in the health field refers to the claims that an organization stakes out for itself in terms of 1) disease covered, 2) population served, 3) services rendered." (Levine and White, 1961:597)

Extrapolating from Levine and White's study, Thompson (1967) applies their findings more broadly to all organizations. "With appropriate modifications in the specifics of the definition - for example, substituting "range of products" for "diseases covered" - the concept of domain appears useful for the analysis of all types of complex organizations." (Thompson, 1967:26)
"Hence the organization's domain identifies the points at which the organization is dependent on inputs from the environment. The composition of that environment, the location within it of capacities, in turn determine upon whom the organization is dependent." (Thompson, 1967:27)

Thompson and Levine and White point out the organization can operationalize its domain only if their claims are recognized and supported by the task environment. The process of obtaining "domain consensus" can constrain the activities the organization wishes to pursue.

"The relationship between an organization and its task environment is essentially one of exchange, and unless the organization is judged by those in contact with it as offering something desirable, it will not receive the inputs necessary for survival." (Thompson, 1967:28)

"Domain consensus defines a set of expectations for members of an organization and for others with whom they interact, about what the organization will and will not do." (Thompson, 1967:29)

If, as most organization theorists suggest (Burns and Stalker, Lawrence and Lorsch, Thompson) organizations must adapt to their environment to maintain and increase their effectiveness, then the "knowing" and understanding of that environment may be based on perceptions of the environment rather than more objective indicators of environmental conditions. Miles, Snow and Pfeffer (1974) found top management of various organizations within the same environment had different perceptions of environmental uncertainty and change. Child (1972) also maintains that an organization's response to the environment is strongly influenced by the manager's perceptions of that environment. The conceptual work of Downey and Slocum (1975), Galbraith (1973) and Weick's (1969) enacted
environment all affirm the significance of environmental perception. Duncan (1972) in developing an uncertainty measure and a perceived environmental characteristic dynamism and complexity measure, found a correlation between a perception of a dynamic complex environment and a perception of uncertainty.

Environmental uncertainty, created by the lack of complete knowledge and control of causal effect relations can create special problems for the organization.

"Uncertainty itself is not problematic. It is a problem for organization only when the uncertainty involves important interaction with other environmental elements that are important for the organization. Uncertainty is only problematic when it involves an element of critical organizational inter-dependence." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:68)

Management of the task environment is affected by managerial perceptions of that environment and the uncertainty within that environment. Thompson (1967) describes an organization's attempt to "buffer its core technology" from environmental influences. Organizations employ additional means to handle uncertainty and minimize their dependency on their task environment. Cooperative strategies are "distinct agreements of commitment of exchange with other organizations in the task environment." (Brown, 1964:176) Cooperative strategies can include contracting for future exchange of performance, coopting as described by Selznick, (1949) merging, joint-ventures, etc. Indirect strategies can involve third party negotiators, trade associations, coordinating groups or government agencies. To lessen dependency and reduce uncertainty, an organization may also redefine its domain and shift its environment. Thompson (1967) identifies boundary spanning, rationing, smoothing and adaptation as independent means to manage the task environment.
Building upon Thompson's theory, Galbraith (1976) identifies additional strategies organizations develop to reduce the effects of uncertainty and thus increase the processing of information.

Hedberg et al. (1976:41) prescribe the creation of organizational tents to "...meet social and technological changes and reap advantage from them."

Litwak and Hylton (1962) in their study of coordinating agencies, found integration with national agencies, or coordination with local agencies were methods used to reduce the uncertainty of obtaining resources.

Proponents of environmental scanning (Terry, 1977) maintain organizations are capable of influencing and changing their environment. "The emphasis on environmental scanning should be on how the environment may best be influenced to meet the needs of the organization." (Terry, 1977:7)

The environment is continually scanned to identify and locate any problems which may emanate from the environment and their degree of influence on the organization.

Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) have recently published a theoretical book based on developing an understanding of organizations and their survival, from the perspective of their resource-dependence on their task environment. They maintain that most researchers have focused on the organization's use of resources rather than the acquisition of resources.

"Our position is that organizations survive to the extent that they are effective. Their effectiveness derives from the management of demands, particularly the demands of interest groups upon which the organizations depend for resources and support.

The key to organizational survival is the ability to acquire and maintain resources. This problem would be simplified if organi-
organizations were in complete control of all the components necessary for their operation. However, no organization is completely self-contained. Organizations are embedded in an environment comprised of other organizations. They depend on those other organizations for the many resources they themselves require. ...Organizations must transact with other elements in their environment to acquire needed resources.

The fact that organizations are dependent for survival and success on their environment does not, in itself, make their existence problematic. If stable supplies were assured from the sources of needed resources, there would be no problem. If the resources needed by the organization were continually available, even if outside their control, there would be no problem. Problems arise not merely because organizations are dependent on their environment, but because this environment is not dependable. (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:2-3)

In addition to Pfeffer and Salancik's emphasis on the importance of contexts as determinants of organizational behavior, they describe the role of the manager with this theoretical perspective.

"...management can adjust and alter the social context surrounding the organization or can facilitate the organization's adjustment to its context. Both activities require understanding the social context and the interrelationship between context and the organization." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:20)

Theoretical Framework

Environmental uncertainty can create problems for the organization. As an open system, the organization is dependent upon its task environment for its inputs and acceptance of its outputs. The potential power relationship between the task environment and the focal organization and the relative uncertainty of that environment impacts upon the autonomy and decision making ability of the organization.

Organization's environment has received considerable attention in regards to its interrelationship and perhaps causal nature with the structure and internal control of the focal organization. Theorists have recently explored how organizations manage environmental demands to
"transcend the constraints of its operating environment without sacrificing power over its operations." (Berkes, 1978)

Building upon Pfeffer's conceptualization of resource-dependence, Levine & White's identification of an organization's domain, Dill's definition of a task environment, Thompson, Katz & Kahn, etc., categories of organization response, Bobbitt (1978) has constructed a resource-dependency model providing a vehicle for arraying such data and viewing an organization's linkage to its larger system.

The organization in an attempt to remain viable, based on meeting its goals and objectives and functional requirements for survival, defines its domain in terms of the population it serves, the services it provides, its range of products and location. (Levine & White, 1961) The organization's domain is dependent upon its task environment for needed resources as defined by the assessment criteria established by the dominant coalition. The task environment thus holds potential power over the organization; the organization will attempt to reduce this dependency and uncertainty through independent and cooperative actions. The task environment defined as an organization's customers, suppliers of resources, competition, and regulators (Dill, 1962) is a part of the organization's larger environment which can exert some measure of control, contraints and contingencies on the organization, its domain and task environment. The turbulent nature of the environment (Emery and Trist, 1963) creates additional uncertainty in terms of the organization's physical setting, technology and information, economic, political and social (values, norms) setting in which it exists (Katz and Kahn, 1966).

In an attempt to reduce dependency for resources (capital, values,
personnel, etc.) and reduce uncertainty, organizations plan and enact strategies, both independent and cooperative. The organization attempts a balancing act, it wants to maintain as much autonomy and decision making as possible while reducing its dependency on the environment. Independent strategies, as described by Thompson (1962) and Galbraith (1976) include the use of public relations, competition, volunteerism. Katz and Kahn (1966) include organizational growth and expansion as a means to incorporate the needed resources into the organization itself. Cooperative strategies involve other organizations of the social system and include contracting, coalition, cooptation (Thompson, 1962), boundary spanning (Katz and Kahn, 1966) and strategic maneuvering (Galbraith, 1976).
Chapter III

Design of the Study

In the preceding chapters, the focus has been on establishing the contextual basis of the study's purpose. In Chapter One the discussion centered upon the need to characterize the type of domains established by school districts, identify the resource dependencies between the district's domain and its task environment and compare the theoretical approach to the identification of dependency with the perceptions of superintendents. Chapter Two traced the growth and development of the theoretical models upon which this study is based.

The following definition of domain was derived from the work of Levine and White (1971) and Thompson (1967).

An organization carves out its domain by declaring its function (goals) and organizing a process to operationalize that function. The domain of an organization is defined by: 1. the population it decides to serve, 2. the types of services it decides to offer that population, 3. the range and types of products it decides to offer that population, and 4. its physical location.

In defining its domain, the organization establishes dependencies with those factors in the environment it needs for its continued survival.

Dill (1962) in his study of two Norwegian firms, identified four major components of an organization's task environment: 1. customers, 2. suppliers of resources, 3. competition, and 4. regulators. If those factors are in abundant supply, survival is not threatened and little
adaptation or adjustment is required. Following the World War II baby boom, public schools could narrowly define the population to be served, children from six to eighteen years of age, without threat. The supply of children was in abundance. It is when needed resources become scarce that the dependent relationship between the organization and its task environment can have a direct effect upon the functioning and ultimate survival of the organization. With the reduction in the number of children, public schools adapt to their changing environment. Traditionally their adaptation has been reactive, for example, closing schools rather than redefining the population to be served.

In an attempt to develop an understanding of: 1. the dependencies established in the task environment of public schools through the declaration of domain, and 2. the reactive nature of response to changes in the task environment, three areas were investigated. Based on the theoretical assumption that organizations similar in purpose have different domains, the first task undertaken was to identify the domains of public schools in the State of Ohio. Ohio was selected for a number of reasons. Ohio's public school system is organized on a local basis with 616 separate school districts, each with a superintendent and Board of Education. (This does not include the county vocational school districts.) Due to the large number of superintendents, it was feasible to collect data from a valid sample large enough to provide workable data. Ohio's method of school financing also provided one quantitative measure of successful interaction with the environment, public voting on school levies.

Once the domains of Ohio's public schools were identified, based on data collected from superintendents, the second task was to identify the
task environment for each domain. Based on Dill's identification of task environment components, data collected about school district characteristics was used to identify the task environment for each category of school district in Ohio. Using Pfeffer and Salancik's description of the dependent relationship between the organization and its task environment, areas of dependency were deduced from the constructed data. These were compared to the superintendents' perceptions of environmental factors upon whom they were dependent. The levy passage history of each school district category was overlaid upon this comparison and analyzed for its significance.

Chapter Two traced the development of the theories and research findings which focus upon the interrelationship between the organization and its environment. Reports of empirical studies and other writings with a focus on the organization and its environment were reviewed for contributions they offered to an understanding of the interrelationship between the two. No studies were uncovered which described or explored the environment of public school organizations; none were found to describe the nature of dependency between a public school and its task environment. The majority of research related to public school environments has focused on community power in relation to types of school boards and superintendents. The types and natures of community groups were linked to the composition and characteristics of the school board and superintendent. No attempt was made to examine causality or assess effectiveness. Thus, a review of the literature on public school organization and their environments uncovered little which contribute to the understanding of the dependency created between an organization and its environment.

In the remainder of this chapter the methods used in conducting this study to collect and analyze data are described.
Data Collection

To develop a typology of educational organizations (K-12) in the state of Ohio based on Levine and White's model of an organization's domain, to identify the task environment for each resulting category and to suggest possible applications of Pfeffer & Salancik's resource-dependence model, data must be gathered on specific characteristics of public schools in Ohio. The methodology employed must allow the researcher the capabilities of obtaining accurate, indepth information from a large number of people and organizations. The study will utilize a combination of survey research, semi-structured interviews, and use of documents as its means of data collection.

The study design will be exploratory, in that it will "achieve new insights which can guide further research" and descriptive, in that it will "define and portray the characteristics of the object of research." (Scott, 1962:267) The study will be guided by the theoretical models of Pfeffer and Salancik's resource dependence, Dill's definition of task environment, Levine and White' conception of domain, Bobbit's adaptation of the resource-dependency model, and the research questions stated previously in the proposal.

Relationship of Method and Theoretical Framework

Scott points out the need for organizational theorists to work with theoretical models as a focus of study rather than using a single hypothesis as the beacon guiding the inquiry.

"...as organization theory develops, the researcher should be less and less inclined to think in terms of one or more hypothesis guiding his (sic) inquiry and begin to work with theoretical models which generate
numerous implications, each of which becomes a proposition guiding field observations." (Scott, 1962:268-269)

The theoretical models employed in this study provide the framework to examine the complex environmental and sociocultural settings and dynamic interactions between focal organizations and their task environments. (Van Dalen, 1973:208)

Data Collection: Primary and Secondary Documents, Expert Informant Reports, Questionnaire, Semi-Structured Interviews.

Primary and Secondary Documents

A document transmits meaning. It consists of "...impressions made on some human brain by past events and consciously recorded for the purpose of transmitting information. (Good & Scates, 1954:180) Scott (1965:284) cautions the researcher to use "extreme care in using and interpreting all such materials." Documents can provide written and oral evidence of an event, sequence of events, official intentions, etc. Documents are written by people and thus are never completely objective. They are useful for the recorded information they contain, but should not be accepted at "face value." They must be subjected to internal criticism (credibility) and external criticism (authenticity).

One of the most reliable types of documents are records, defined by Gottschalk (1969:17) as "documents intended to convey instructions regarding a transaction or to aid the memory of the persons involved in the transaction." Reports tend to be less reliable since they often contain some justification or interpretation of the event. "Reports differ from records in that they are usually written after the event, they are often intended to create an impression rather than merely to aid memory and they
Both primary and secondary documents from the Ohio State Department of Education and individual school districts were used to ascertain demographic, financial, and other school related data. Gottschalk (1969) points out the usefulness of both primary and secondary sources since they contain primary particulars or suggest leads to primary particulars.

Information verifying levy passage and school district demographics were obtained from published records of the Ohio State Department of Education. Records of personnel histories and student attendance were obtained from selected school districts to spot check the accuracy of the superintendents' reporting of this information.

Expert Informant Reports

Scott (1965:288) identifies the use of an informant as an expert (rather than as a representative or surrogate informant) when the informants are "asked to employ their special knowledge and skills on behalf of the research project."

Two hundred randomly selected Ohio school superintendents were asked to complete a questionnaire describing the characteristics of their school district. The superintendent was used as an expert informant on matters related to the organization and policy of their district. The perceptions of the superintendent were gathered in a separate section of the questionnaire and are not considered as factual data.

Superintendents as the chief executive and administrator of a school district are intimately familiar with the organizational structure, policy and practices of that organization. Their position within the system allows them a global perspective and access to any type of specific
information collected. Since they are instrumental in policy development and implementation they can be considered experts in regard to the characteristics of their school district.

**Questionnaire** The questionnaire is defined by Van Dalen (1973:342) as used to "obtain facts about past, present and anticipated events, conditions and practices and to make inquiries concerning attitudes and conditions. Isolating specific questions for consideration tends to objectify, intensify and standardize the observations that respondents make."

Since we needed a variety of information, both factual and perceptual, from 200 school superintendents, use of a written questionnaire was the only practical method of data collection. The standardization of responses allowed for clustering the information to develop categories of school districts and identify components of their task environment.

Questionnaires were thus used to gather information relevant to categorizing Ohio school districts by domain, identification of the school district's task environment and to capture the perceptions of the superintendent on related issues. Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of public school superintendents in the state of Ohio. (Appendix A) An introductory letter explaining the purpose of the study was mailed to each participant in addition to the questionnaire. (Appendix B) First mailings were made during May, 1979, followed by a reminder letter to non-respondents in July and August, 1979. (Appendix C) The results of the study were made available to those participants who were interested.

The questionnaire is organized in two sections designed to gather different types of information. In Section I questions were developed based on Levine and White's model of domain. To identify the population
served, respondents were asked to identify the socio-cultural background of their students and to specify the grade levels served. Categories were developed for each type of possible response. Respondents checked the number of services provided by their school district. Categories were developed based on the number of services provided. To identify location, respondents were asked to categorize their district in terms of its economic and social setting. Categories were developed for each type of possible response. Respondents checked the number of products offered by their school district. Categories were developed based on the number of products offered.

Part II questions were developed based on Dill's identification of components of the task environment. In attempting to identify the customers of a school district's output, respondents were asked to give the percentage of the district's graduates who entered various post high school pasttimes. Questions were asked to gather data about the various resources the school district uses. Questions were asked about school personnel, finance and materials and supplies. Data were gathered to identify potential competition from other types of schools.

Part III questions asked respondents to give their perceptions concerning the product, customers, resources, competition, regulatory agencies and sources of dependency for their school district.

Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with twenty individuals serving as superintendents in Ohio school districts during the 1978-79 school year. Madge defined semi-structured interviews as:

Semi-structured questions can be of two types: "those in which the response is structured and the stimulus left free...and
those in which the stimulus is structured and the response left free." (Madge, 1953:166)

The interview questions were structured and the response left free. An interview guide (Appendix H) was developed based upon Pfeffer and Salancik's model of resource-dependence in the task environment, and pilot-interviews conducted with two superintendents not included in the study sample. Since the questions posed were open-ended, the respondents characterized their organization's dependence in their own terms.

The semi-structured interview "requires certain items of information about each respondent but allows the interviewer to rephrase the question in keeping with his understanding." (Goode and Hatt, 1952:186) "The interview explores what people think and do by what they express in conversation with the interviewer." (Good and Scates, 1965:647) All interviews were conducted in person. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed in their entirety. All respondents were assured their identities would remain confidential. All interviews were conducted during the month of May, 1979 and the first week of June, 1979.

**Sampling Procedure**

**Questionnaire**

A table of random numbers was used to select 200 out of the total population of 616 individuals serving as superintendents of public school districts in the state of Ohio during the 1978-79 school year.

"A random sample is a sample so drawn that each possible sample of that size has an equal probability of being selected." (Minium:1970) The table of random numbers was taken from page 99 of The Rand Corporation, *A Million Random Digits with 100,000 Normal Deviates*. 
The first three digits were read vertically from top to bottom from columns one through eight. The page number, column and starting place were determined by chance selection. Each element of the population was assigned an identification number (1 to 616). Since the sampling procedure was without replacement, identification numbers recurring were skipped.

Interview Sample

A total of twenty superintendents were interviewed. The small number limits the stability of response and generability of findings. Thus, the use of these findings are confined to the identification of areas for further indepth study. The twenty superintendents were selected from the study sample of 200. In order to provide some level of representativeness, interviewees were selected from the four strata of Ohio public school districts developed by that state's Educational Review Committee:

1. Central City Districts - Districts associated with cities having 1970 populations of at least 49,000.

2. Satellite City Districts - Urban area districts associated with satellite cities, cities which are near and dominated by a larger city. This includes bedroom suburbs, industrial enclaves, and balanced cities in vicinity of larger, central cities.

3. Independent Urban Districts - Associated with independent cities with 5,000-42,000 population in 1970. These are employment centers surrounded by rural areas.

4. Rural Districts - Districts without any city of over 5,000 population in 1970.

(1) The majority (80%) of the interviews were conducted by a fellow researcher as part of a companion study.
The interview sample matched the proportion of the state's school districts that fall within each stratum. Of the twenty superintendents interviewed, two worked in central city districts, six in satellite city districts, four in independent urban districts, and eight in rural districts. In addition, the selection criteria included geographical location. The sample included six superintendents in the northwest, five in the southwest, five in the northeast, two in the southeast and two, central.

**Analysis of Data**

Several methods of data analysis were used in four stages to achieve the objectives of this study.

**Quantitative Summarization of Data**

The first stage of data analysis involved the simple quantitative summarization of part one questionnaire data. Categories of school districts were developed from the frequency of responses about domain that clustered together. Of the 121 school district respondents clustered into a specific category based on domain characteristics 34 did not significantly cluster with any other district's characteristics.

Percentage of levy passage over the past ten years was calculated for each school district category. The $X^2$ nonparametric test was used to test for significance between the categories.

**Qualitative Analysis**

The third stage of analysis was based on application of the theoretical models described in this study to part two questionnaire data to identify the task environment for each category of school district. Components of the task environment were identified and discussed in relation to the concept of dependency. The theoretically derived task environments were compared to the responses of the superintendents on their perception of
elements in the task environment. The data received from the superintendents were subjected to a rating scale to analyze their responses.

The final stage of analysis focused on the data received from the 20 superintendent interviews. Their identification of sources of dependency was compared to the theoretically derived identification of dependencies.

The similarities and differences were discussed within the framework of resource dependency and enacted environments.

Procedures

The study is composed of four sequential sections. For the first task, the identification of categories of Ohio school districts based on their domains, data were collected from the Ohio State Department of Education and from a written questionnaire of randomly selected Ohio public school superintendents.

The definition of school district's domain was operationalized by gathering data about each of the four components of an organization's domain: 1) the population served, 2) the services rendered, 3) the range of products offered, and 4) the location.

To identify the population served by a school district, the following two responses were asked:

1. Our school district offers an academic program for grades:
   - K-12  K-Adult  1-12  1-Adult  Pre-School  Pre-School-Adult

2. The majority (over 50%) of students attending our public schools represent a similar (homogeneous) socio-cultural background
   - Yes
   - No

Based on the response to these 2 statements, each school district was assigned the appropriate descriptor. The following combinations of
responses were possible:

COMBINATIONS & DESCRIPTORS

Traditional-Singular  
K-12, homogeneous

Traditional-Multiple  
K-12, heterogeneous

Extended\(^1\)-Singular  
Pre-12, homogeneous

Extended\(^1\)-Multiple  
Pre-12, heterogeneous

Extended\(^2\)-Singular  
K-Adult, homogeneous

Extended\(^2\)-Multiple  
K-Adult, heterogeneous

Expanded-Singular  
Pre-Adult, homogeneous

Expanded-Multiple  
Pre-Adult, heterogeneous

To identify the types of services rendered, the superintendent was asked to check from a suggested list the services provided to the students and community. Each district was assigned a descriptor dependent upon the number of services offered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES RENDERED</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>7 OR MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Facilities MODERATE

Entertainment

Summer Program

Other

The location of a school district was based upon response to two questions, one identifying its physical location, the other identifying its socio-economic location. Based on the data collected, each school district was assigned the appropriate descriptor. The following combinations of responses were possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Combinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Ur-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ur-Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ur-Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Ur-Mx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru-Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Ru-Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru-Mx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class Economy</td>
<td>Su-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Su-Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Class Economy</td>
<td>Su-Lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class Economy</td>
<td>Su-Mx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To identify the range of products offered to students, the superintendent was asked to check from a suggested list the products available. Each district was assigned a descriptor dependent upon the number of products provided.
### RANGE OF PRODUCTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
<td>7 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENRICHMENT (ART, MUSIC)</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETIC</td>
<td>4-6 products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL EDUCATION</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIFTED</td>
<td>3 or less products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each school district was assigned a descriptor for the four components of an organization's domain. A 24 by 36 matrix was constructed displaying every possible combination of response (864). (Appendix D) Each district was placed in the matrix according to their four descriptors. Categories of school districts were formed from the school districts which clustered together on the matrix. A minimum of three districts was required to form a category. Ten categories of school districts were identified.
Categories of School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Products Offered</th>
<th>Service Rendered</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>17% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Rural-Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>17% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Suburban-Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Lo-Mid Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>9% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Suburban-Mid Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>23% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Rural-Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>11% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Middle Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Suburban-Mid Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>3% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Urban-Middle Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The task environment of each school district category is composed of the district's clients or customers, the resources it needs to stay in operation, its competitors, and its regulatory agencies. Information on school districts was collected from the questionnaire concerning each component of the task environment.

To identify the customers or consumers of the district's product, the superintendent was asked what percent of the district's graduates entered the job market, a college program, vocational training, or other areas. Questions related to the training and procurement of school personnel, their affiliation with unions or professional groups, school finance, and purchase of textbooks and supplies were used to clarify the resources of the district. Questions related to availability of and attendance at other types of schools were used to identify sources of competition.
The superintendents were asked to list the specific regulatory agencies with which they interact.

The resulting data were arrayed for each category of school district. Simple statistics (average, percent) were used to arrive at a generalizable description of the components of the task environment. An example: for category one school districts, an average of 45% of the graduating students directly entered the job market. This type of statistical analysis was performed on all ten categories of districts. An $X^2$ nonparametric test was used to test for significance of difference between the responses of each category.

"When frequencies in discrete categories (either nominal or ordinal) constitute the data of research, the $x^2$ test may be used to determine the significance of the difference among independent groups." (Siegel, 1956:42)

Based on the data received about the districts' characteristics in part three of the study, the task environment was described for each school district category. In the process of identifying the particular make-up of the task environment, potential areas of dependency were identified and discussed. For example, a source of dependency could be on a state's university system if category two school district hired 98% of its teaching staff from an Ohio State University.

These theoretically derived conceptualizations of categories of task environment and resource-dependence were compared to the responses of the superintendents from those districts. The questionnaire asked superintendents to identify the following components of their districts' environment: the product or output of its schools, its customers, the types of resources upon which it is dependent, who or what is in competition with the district, what regulatory agencies impact upon the district, and the
most important elements in the environment. The responses were grouped by district categories and given a 1 to 10 rating based on the content or nature of the response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output or Product</th>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general-educated students</td>
<td>specific-society</td>
<td>general-financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific entries or skills</td>
<td>specific-business</td>
<td>varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Regulatory Agencies</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>2 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concrete answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>abstract concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final section of the study raises possible hypothesis for further investigation. Data were collected from the questionnaire and reaffirmed by public records on the history of levy passage for each school district in the study. The percent of districts with successful levy passage was calculated allowing the investigator to determine if there are possible commonalities among school districts with a similar domain and task environment. A sample of Ohio superintendents were interviewed to identify their perceptions of the organization's task environment and points of dependency. These perceptions were compared with the results of the theoretically derived descriptions of task environment and resource-dependence.
Chapter IV
Interpretation and Presentation of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the findings of the investigation.

The objectives of the study were to: (1) develop a typology of public schools in Ohio based on their domain; (2) identify components of the task environment for each category of school district; (3) identify sources of dependency between school districts and their task environment; (4) compare the perceptions of the districts' superintendents concerning dependency to the theoretically derived conceptualizations; (5) determine the relationship between levy passage and category of school district; (6) summarize the understandings of 20 randomly selected Ohio superintendents about resource-dependency and procurement of those resources. A detailed description of the procedures used to obtain these objectives was described in Chapter III.

Analysis of Data

Typology of School Districts

Each school district was assigned a descriptor for the four components of its domain: population served, services rendered, products offered and location. A 24 by 36 matrix was constructed displaying every
possible combination of response (864). Each district was placed in the matrix according to their four descriptors. Categories of school districts were formed from the districts which clustered on the matrix. Ten categories of school districts emerged which were used as the basis for identifying the task environment and areas of dependency for public schools in Ohio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Products Offered</th>
<th>Service Rendered</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>17% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Complete</td>
<td>Rural-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>17% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Complete</td>
<td>Suburban-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Low Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>9% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Standard</td>
<td>Suburban-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>23% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Partial Complete</td>
<td>Rural-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>11% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Partial Standard</td>
<td>Rural-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>5% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Partial Standard</td>
<td>Suburban-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>3% Traditional-Singular</td>
<td>Full Complete</td>
<td>Urban-Md Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%
Task Environment and Dependencies

The task environment of any organization is composed of four main elements: its customers, the resources it needs to remain in operation, its competitors and its regulatory agencies. The components of the task environment for each category of school district are identified based on information collected from the districts and verified through public documents.

A description of the task environment for each school district category is presented on pages 65-80. The four main elements of the task environment are broken down into subsets and the statistics of mean and percent are used to describe the quantitative mixture within each element.

The description of each category's task environment is followed by a general description of areas of dependency between a category of school district and its task environment, and a comparison of the major dependencies for each category.

An $\chi^2$ nonparametric test was used to test the null hypothesis that no significant differences exist between categories of school districts in relation to their population served, their suppliers of resources, their competition for students, and their passage of levies. The null hypothesis was rejected at a .05 level of significance for all the tests. Thus the data supported the hypothesis that there is a significant difference between categories of school districts in relation to their population served, their suppliers of resources, their competition for students and their passage of levies.
POPULATION SERVED

Analysis of Variance

Population directly served by the output of the districts by category of school district.

Null Hypothesis: $H_0$ There is no significant difference between categories of school districts in relation to the population directly served by the output (students) of the districts.

$H_1$ There is a significant difference between categories of school districts and the population they serve.

Statistical Test: Since the groups under study are more than two and independent, a statistical test for $K$ independent samples is called for. Since the data are in discrete categories, the $X^2$ test is an appropriate one.

Significance Level: Let $\alpha = 0.01$ $n = 86$ the number of school districts whose population served was identified.

Sampling Distribution: Under the null hypothesis, $X^2$ is distributed approximately as chi square with $df = (K-1)(r-1)$. The probability associated with the occurrence under $H_0$ of values as large as an observed value of $X^2$ is from the table of critical values of chi square (Siegel:1956)

Rejection Region: The region of rejection consists of all values of $X^2$ which are so large that the probability associated with their occurrence under the $H_0$ is equal to less than $\alpha = 0.01$.

Decision: Table Two gives the number of school districts by category with over 50% of their student graduate population directly entering the job market. School district categories 1, 2, 10; 3, 4, 5, 6; and 8, 9 were grouped together because of the small number of districts falling into
some of the categories. The grouping is based on shared domain characteristics, location being the only varying characteristic. Table Two also shows the number of districts by category which might be expected under $H_0$ to have over 50% of their student graduates directly enter the job market.

Table Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of School Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Entry into Job Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\sum 5.27 + 8.50 + 1.07 + 88 = 15.72$$

$n = 86$

$$X^2 = 15.72$$

$df = 3$

$H_0$ is rejected at .01 level of significance
SUPPLIERS OF RESOURCES

Analysis of Variance

1. Certified personnel with membership (over 50%) in a professional organization by categories of school districts.

2. District budget finances generated locally (over 50% of finances) by categories of school districts.

3. Teaching related supplies and materials (over 50%) purchased locally by categories of school districts.

Null Hypothesis:

$H_0$ 1. There is no significant difference between categories of school districts and the membership of certified personnel in professional organizations.

$H_1$ There is a significant difference between categories of school districts and the membership of certified personnel in professional organizations.

$H_0$ 2. There is no significant difference between categories of school districts and the district budget finances which are generated locally.

$H_1$ There is a significant difference between categories of school districts and the district budget finances which are generated locally.

---

1 No analysis of variance was performed on question 2 & 3, Part II, since there was little variation in response. No analysis was performed on question 5, Part II, since the numbers of responses were too small to analyze.
$H_0$ 3. There is no significant difference between categories of school districts and the teaching related supplies and materials purchased locally.

$H_1$ There is a significant difference between categories of school districts and the teaching related supplies and materials purchased locally.

**Statistical Test:** Since the groups under study are more than two and independent, a statistical test for $K$ independent samples is called for. Since the data are in discrete categories, the $X^2$ test is an appropriate one.

**Significance Level:** Let $\alpha = 0.01$ $n = 86$ the number of school districts whose population served was identified.

**Sampling Distribution:** Under the null hypothesis, $X^2$ is distributed approximately as chi square with $df = (K-1)(r-1)$. The probability associated with the occurrence under $H_0$ of values as large as an observed value of $X^2$ is from the table of critical values of chi square (Siegel:1956).

**Rejection Region:** The region of rejection consists of all values of $X^2$ which are so large that the probability associated with their occurrence under the $H_0$ is equal to less than $\alpha = 0.01$.

**Decision:** Table Three gives the number of school districts by category of certified personnel with membership (over 50%) in a professional organization. The number of districts by category which might be expected under $H_0$ to have membership in a professional organization is also included.
Table Three

Categories of School Districts

Membership in Professional Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1, 2, 10</th>
<th>3, 4, 5, 6</th>
<th>8, 9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>17.15</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[2.87 + 3.59 + 1.44 + .58 = 8.48\]

\[n = 86\]

\[X^2 = 8.48\]

\[df = 3\]

\[H_0\] is accepted at .01 level of significance

\[H_0\] is rejected at .05 level of significance

Table Four gives the number of school districts by category of district budget finances generated locally (over 50% of finances). The number of districts by category which might be expected under \(H_0\) to have district budgets financed locally is also included.

Table Four

Categories of School Districts

Finance Generated Locally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1, 2, 10</th>
<th>3, 4, 5, 6</th>
<th>8, 9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[4.85 + 3.97 + 2.44 + .67 = 11.93\]

\[n = 86\]

\[X^2 = 11.93\]

\[df = 3\]

\[H_0\] is rejected at .01 level of significance
Table Five gives the number of school districts by category of teaching related supplies and materials (over 50%) purchased locally. The number of districts by category which might be expected under $H_0$ to have teaching related supplies and materials purchased locally is also included.

Table Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of School Districts</th>
<th>Supplies Purchased Locally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$4.10 + 3.74 + 1.87 + .75 = 10.46$

$n = 86$

$x^2 = 10.46$

$df = 3$

$H_0$ is accepted at .01 level of significance

$H_0$ is rejected at .02 level of significance
COMPETITION FOR STUDENTS

Analysis of Variance

School Districts by category with less than 5% of eligible students attending a non-public school.

Null Hypothesis: \( H_0 \)  There is no significant difference between categories of school districts and the percent of eligible students attending non-public schools.

\[ H_1 \]  There is a significant difference between categories of school districts and the percent of eligible students attending a non-public school.

Statistical Test: Since the groups under study are more than two and independent, a statistical test for \( K \) independent samples is called for. Since the data are in discrete categories, the \( X^2 \) test is an appropriate one.

Significance Level: Let \( \alpha = 0.01 \)  \( n = 86 \)  the number of school districts whose population served was identified.

Sampling Distribution: Under the null hypothesis, \( X^2 \) is distributed approximately as chi square with \( df = (K-1)(r-1) \). The probability associated with the occurrence under \( H_0 \) of values as large as an observed value of \( X^2 \) is from the table of critical values of chi square (Siegel:1956)

Rejection Region: The region of rejection consists of all values of \( X^2 \) which are so large that the probability associated with their occurrence under the \( H_0 \) is equal to less than \( \alpha = 0.01 \).

Decision: Table Six gives the number of school districts by category with less than 5% of their eligible students attending a non-public school. The number of districts by category which might be expected under \( H_0 \) to
have less than 5% attend a non-public school is also included.

Table Six

Categories of School Districts

Less than 5% Attend Non-public Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1, 2, 10</th>
<th>3, 4, 5, 6</th>
<th>8, 9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
5.97 + 7 + 3.5 + .74 = 17.21
\]

\[
n = 86
\]

\[
\chi^2 = 17.21
\]

\[
df = 3
\]

\[H_0\] is rejected at .01 level of significance
LEVY PASSAGE

Analysis of Variance

Successful passage of levies (60% or better) since 1969 by category of school district.

Null Hypothesis: \( H_0 \) There is no significant difference between categories of school districts and their levy passage history.

\( H_1 \) There is a significant difference between categories of school districts and their levy passage.

Statistical Test: Since the groups under study are more than two and independent, a statistical test for \( K \) independent samples is called for. Since the data are in discrete categories, the \( \chi^2 \) test is an appropriate one.

Significance Level: Let \( \alpha = 0.01 \) \( n = 86 \) the number of school districts whose percent of levy passage were determined.

Sampling Distribution: Under the null hypothesis, \( \chi^2 \) is distributed approximately as chi square with df = \((K-1)(r-1)\). The probability associated with the occurrence under \( H_0 \) of values as large as an observed value of \( \chi^2 \) is from the table of critical values of chi square (Siegel:1956)

Rejection Region: The region of rejection consists of all values of \( \chi^2 \) which are so large that the probability associated with their occurrence under the \( H_0 \) is equal to less than \( \alpha = 0.01 \).

Decision: Table One gives the number of school districts by category, with successful levy passage (60% or above) since 1969, of the 87 studied. School district categories 1, 2, 10; 3, 4, 5, 6; 8, 9; were grouped together because of the small number of districts falling into some of these categories. The grouping is consistent with guidelines provided
by Siegel (1956). Table One also shows the number of districts by category, which might be expected under $H_0$ to have a successful levy passage history.

**Table One**

**Categories of School Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful Levy Passage History</th>
<th>1, 2, 10</th>
<th>3, 4, 5, 6</th>
<th>8, 9</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$5.79 + 4.41 + 1.8 + .466 = 12.46$

$n = 87$

$x^2 = 12.46$

$df = 3$

$H_0$ is rejected at .01 level of significance
### Description of Task Environment

**Category One: Traditional (K-12) Singular (homogeneous backgrounds)**

**Products Offered:** Full  
**Services Rendered:** Complete  
**Location:** Rural-Middle Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>Customers:</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two and Four Year Colleges</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical/Vocational Schools</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Military, Family, Welfare)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suppliers of Resources:</th>
<th>Certified Personnel</th>
<th>Non-Certified Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trained in Ohio State Schools</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represented by Professional Organization</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruited Locally</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represented by Professional Organization</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Organized Group Representation</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally Funded</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funded</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Funded</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplies</th>
<th>Mean Percent of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Purchase Agent or Organization</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Individually by Local District</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitors:</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private School Attendance</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sectarian</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (As Identified by Superintendents):**  
Inflation  
All other publically supported agencies  
Joint Vocational Schools
Regulatory Agencies:  
State Department of Education  
Department of Health, Education & Welfare  
Department of Labor  
Ohio State Legislature  
Environmental Protection Agency  
North Central Accredidation  
Special Education Services  
Local Court System  
State and Federal Mandates with No Financial Support  
Title IX
Category Two:

**DOMAIN**
- Population Served: Traditional (K-12)
- Products Offered: Full
- Services Rendered: Complete
- Location: Suburban-Middle Class

**TASK**

**ENVIRONMENT**
- Customers: Business and Industry 37%
- Two and Four Year Colleges 40%
- Technical/Vocational Schools 11%
- Other 06%

**Suppliers of Resources:**
- Certified Personnel:
  - Trained in Ohio State Schools 73%
  - Represented by Professional Organization 93%
- Non-Certified Personnel:
  - Recruited Locally 98%
  - Represented by Professional Organization 53%
  - No Organized Group Representation 47%

**Revenues**
- Locally Funded 54%
- State Funded 40%
- Federally Funded 06%

**Supplies**
- Central Purchase Agent or Organization 27%
- Purchased Individually by Local District 73%

**Competitors:**
- Private School Attendance 09%
- Religious 98%
- Non-Sectarian 02%
- Other (As Identified by Superintendents)
  - Television
  - Inconsiderate Parents
  - Lure of Market Place
  - Other tax supported agencies
Regulatory Agencies:
State Department of Education
Department of Health, Education, Welfare
Ohio State Legislature
North Central Accreditation
Special Education Services
Local, State, Federal Courts
State Auditor's Office
Federal Government & Agencies
Bureau of Unemployment Compensation
OSHA
OCR
Department of Energy
Title IX
NAACP
Civil Liberties Groups
### Domain

- **Population Served:** Traditional (K-12)
- **Singular (homogeneous backgrounds)**
- **Products Offered:** Full
- **Services Rendered:** Standard
- **Location:** Rural, Lower Middle Class

### Task Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two and Four Year Colleges</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Vocational Schools</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suppliers of Resources:**

- **Certified Personnel**
  - Trained in Ohio State Schools: 91%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 100%

- **Non-Certified Personnel**
  - Recruited Locally: 97%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 100%
  - No Organized Group Representation: 0%

**Revenues**

- Locally Funded: 37%
- State Funded: 58%
- Federally Funded: 6%

**Supplies**

- Central Purchase Agent or Organization: 25%
- Purchased Individually by Local District: 75%

**Competitors:**

- Private School Attendance: 01%
- Religious: 83%
- Non-Sectarian: 02%

**Other (As Identified by Superintendent):**

- Poor Judicial System

### Regulatory Agencies

- State Department of Education
- State and Federal Government
- Ohio State Legislature
- Office of Civil Rights
- Federal Agencies
**Category Four:**

**DOMAIN**
- Population Served: Traditional (K-12)
- Singular (homogeneous background)
- Products Offered: Full
- Services Rendered: Standard
- Location: Rural, Mixed

**TASK**

**ENVIRONMENT**
- Customers: Business and Industry 49%
- Two and Four Year Colleges 17%
- Technical/Vocational Schools 7%
- Other (Military, Family, Welfare) 26%

**Suppliers of Resources:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certified Personnel</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained Ohio State Schools</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represented by Professional Organization</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Certified Personnel</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruited Locally</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represented by Professional Organization</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Organized Group Representation</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenues**
- Generated Locally 41%
- State Funded 54%
- Federally Funded 05%

**Supplies**
- Central Purchase Agent or Organization 0
- Purchased Individually by Local District 100%

**Competitors:**
- Private School Attendance 01%
- Religious 100%
- Non-Sectarian 0

**Other (As Identified by Superintendents):**
- Ohio State Legislature
- The Courts
- Federal Agencies
- Welfare Agencies
- Special Interest Groups
- Federal National Forest
Regulatory Agencies:
State Department of Education
Ohio State Legislature
The Courts
Congress
Public Law 94-142 & Fed. 504
Federal Bureaucracy and associated paperwork
Federal and State Agencies
Local Interest Groups
Teachers Union
Category Five:

**DOMAIN**
- Population Served: Traditional (K-12)
- Singular (homogeneous backgrounds)
- Products Offered: Full
- Services Rendered: Standard
- Location: Suburban, Middle Class

**TASK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two and Four Year Colleges</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Vocational Schools</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Military, Family, Welfare)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Suppliers of Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certified Personnel</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained in Ohio State Schools</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represented by Professional Organization</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Certified Personnel</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruited Locally</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represented by Professional Organization</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Organized Group Representation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federally Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplies**

| Mean Percent |
| Cenral Purchase Agent or Organization | 38% |
| Purchased Individually by Local District | 62% |

**Competitors**

| Mean Percent |
| Religious | 91% |
| Non-Sectarian | 09% |

**Other (As Identified by Superintendents)**
- Birth Control
- Lack of Money
- The Media
- Drug Operators
- Business Exploitation of Youth
- Attitudes
- Tax Supported Agencies
Regulatory Agencies:  
State Department of Education  
Department of Health, Education, Welfare  
Ohio State Legislature  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Special Education Laws  
Courts  
State and Federal Mandates  
State and Federal Government  
Unions  
Ohio Governor  
Personal Tax Laws
Category Six:

**DOMAIN**
- Population Served: Traditional (K-12) Singular (homogeneous background)
- Products Offered: Full
- Services Rendered: Standard
- Location: Rural, Middle Class

**TASK**

**ENVIRONMENT**
- Customers: Business and Industry 47%
  - Two and Four Year Colleges 30%
  - Technical/Vocational Schools 16%
  - Other (Military, Family, Welfare) 03%

- Suppliers of Resources:
  - Certified Personnel
    - Trained in Ohio State Schools 80%
    - Represented by Professional Organization 95%
  - Non-Certified Personnel
    - Recruited Locally 97%
    - Represented by Professional Organization 55%
    - No Organized Group Representation 45%

- Revenues
  - Locally Funded 48%
  - State Funded 48%
  - Federally Funded 04%

- Supplies
  - Central Purchase Agent or Organization 60%
  - Purchased Individually by Local District 40%

- Competitors:
  - Private School Attendance 05%
  - Religious 83%
  - Non-Sectarian 13%

**Other (As Identified by Superintendents)**
- Demogogues
- Welfare
- Unemployment
- Federal Taxes
- Federal Deficit Spending
- Tax Supported Agencies
- Public Concern for Quality Education
Non Certified Schools
Drugs, Alcohol, T.V.

Regulatory Agencies:  State Department of Education
                     Department of Health, Education, Welfare
                     Ohio State Legislature
                     Department of Labor
                     Environmental Protection Agency
                     North Central Accreditation
                     State and Federal Mandates
                     Federal Programs
                     State and Federal Law
                     State and Federal Courts
                     All Regulatory Agencies
Category Seven:

**DOMAIN**
- Population Served: Traditional (K-12)
- Products Offered: Partial
- Services Rendered: Complete
- Location: Rural, Middle Class

**TASK**
**ENVIRONMENT**

Customers:
- Business and Industry: 50%
- Two and Four Year Colleges: 32%
- Technical/Vocational Schools: 13%
- Other (Military, Family, Welfare): 04%

Suppliers of Resources:
- Certified Personnel:
  - Trained in Ohio State Schools: 94%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 100%

- Non-Certified Personnel:
  - Recruited Locally: 94%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 25%
  - No Organized Group Representation: 75%

Revenues:
- Locally Funded: 61%
- State Funded: 34%
- Federally Funded: 05%

Supplies:
- Central Purchase Agent or Organization: 0
- Purchased Individually by Local District: 100%

Competitors:
- Private School Attendance: 20%
- Religious: 76%
- Non-Sectarian: 24%

Other (As Identified by Superintendents):
- Public Taxes
- Politics

Regulatory Agencies:
- State and Federal Government
- Teacher Unions
- Government Regulations
## Category Eight:

### DOMAIN
- **Population Served:** Traditional (K-12)  
  Singular (homogeneous background)
- **Products Offered:** Partial  
  Standard
- **Services Rendered:** Standard  
  Rural, Middle Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Mean Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two and Four Year Colleges</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Vocational Schools</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Military, Family, Welfare)</td>
<td>06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Suppliers of Resources: | | |
| Certified Personnel | | |
| Trained in Ohio State Schools | 74% |
| Represented by Professional Organization | 100% |
| Non-Certified Personnel | | |
| Recruited Locally | 98% |
| Represented by Professional Organization | 50% |
| No Organized Group Representation | 50% |

| Revenues | | |
| Locally Funded | 55% |
| State Funded | 40% |
| Federally Funded | 05% |

| Supplies | | |
| Central Purchase Agent or Organization | 20% |
| Purchased Individually by Local District | 80% |

| Competitors: | Mean Percent of Students |
| Private School Attendance | 03% |
| Religious | 88% |
| Non-Sectarian | 12% |

| Other (As Identified by Superintendents) | | |
| Inflation | | |
| Non-educational State Agencies | | |
| Public Opinion | | |
| Tax Supported Agencies | | |
Metropolitan Areas
T.V.
World of Work
Lure of Jobs
Other Public School Districts

Regulatory Agencies:  State Department of Education
                      State and Federal Government
                      Department of Industrial Relations
                      Environmental Protection Agency
                      State Fire Marshall
                      State Auditor
                      County Board of Health
Category Nine:

**DOMAIN**
Population Served: Traditional (K-12)
Singular (homogeneous background)
Products Offered: Partial
Services Rendered: Standard
Location: Suburban, Middle Class

**TASK**
**ENVIRONMENT**
Customers:
- Business and Industrial: 43%
- Two and Four Year Colleges: 45%
- Technical/Vocational Schools: 17%
- Other (Military, Family, Welfare): 04%

Suppliers of Resources:
- Certified Personnel
  - Trained in Ohio State Schools: 89%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 100%
- Non-Certified Personnel
  - Recruited Locally: 100%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 100%
  - No Organized Group Representation: 0

Revenues
- Locally Funded: 66%
- State Funded: 32%
- Federally Funded: 02%

Supplies
- Central Purchase Agent or Organization: 25%
- Purchased Individually by Local District: 75%

Competitors:
- Private School Attendance: 07%
- Religious: 89%
- Non-Sectarian: 11%

Other (As Identified by Superintendents)
- Welfare
- Business
- Entertainment
- Village Government
Regulatory Agencies:  Ohio State Legislature
                      Department of Health, Education, Welfare
                      Federal Government
### Category Ten:

**DOMAIN**
- Population Served: Traditional (K-12)
- Singular (homogeneous background)
- Products Offered: Full
- Services Rendered: Complete
- Location: Urban, Middle Class

### TASK

**ENVIRONMENT**
- Customers:
  - Business and Industry: 44%
  - Two and Four Year Colleges: 33%
  - Technical/Vocational Schools: 14%
  - Other (Military, Family, Welfare): 06%

**Suppliers of Resources:**
- Certified Personnel:
  - Trained in Ohio State Schools: 71%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 100%
- Non-Certified Personnel:
  - Recruited Locally: 98%
  - Represented by Professional Organization: 67%
  - No Organized Group Representation: 33%

**Revenues**
- Locally Funded: 53%
- State Funded: 44%
- Federally Funded: 03%

**Supplies**
- Central Purchase Agent or Organization: 33%
- Purchased Individually by Local District: 67%

**Mean Percent of Students**

**Competitors:**
- Private School Attendance: 11%
- Religious: 90%
- Non-Sectarian: 10%

**Other (As Identified by Superintendents)**
- Other Tax Supported Agencies
Regulatory Agencies:  
State Department of Education  
Ohio State Legislature  
Local Board of Education  
Federal Government  
Local Agencies  
Pressure Groups
## Comparison of Major Dependencies of School District Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppliers of Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Personnel</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Certified Personnel</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
<td>Recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruited Group</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>Locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
<td>Purchased Individually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dependencies On the Task Environment

Customers

The customers of a school district are those organizations which absorb that district's product; an "educated" student. The extent and degree of expected education varies with the type and nature of the customer. For example, military organizations' expectations of their enlisted personnel are different from the expectations a university has of its freshman class. A district is dependent upon its customers for acceptance of its product; it is therefore important for it to recognize who its customers are and to determine their expectations.

Suppliers

A school district needs resources and can become dependent upon its suppliers of resources in times of scarcity. For example, if the majority of a district's certified personnel are trained in a State College or University, the district depends upon those institutions for the quantity and quality of its teaching staff. When the number of people going through teacher certification diminishes, the district must compete with other systems for those teachers. The district is also highly dependent upon the college or university for the type of training and focus of concentration the prospective teacher receives.

Once a resource is supplied, a dependent relationship can exist between the district and the controller of the resource. For example, teachers' professional organizations (NEA, FTA) hold the potential to speak and act for the staff as one, which can establish a power relationship between the district's administration and teaching staff.

Similar types of dependencies exist with a district's non-certified staff.
"Don't bite the hand that feeds you" is an appropriate adage for the necessary relationship between a school district and its main source of revenue. If the majority of a district's revenue is generated locally, the district becomes highly dependent upon its home and property owners and its voters (in times of levies). The district must be able to meet the needs and fulfill the perceived functions of these folks to maintain their financial support. If the majority of revenues are received from the state or federal level, the nature and function of the resulting dependent relationship is very different and needs to be recognized and attended to as such.

The equipment, furniture, textbooks, rulers, chalk, *ad infinitum* which make up the supplies used by school personnel are a necessary component of an educational organization. How a district decides to purchase these items determines the amount of decision making it retains and the amount of power it has to obtain competitive prices. When supplies are purchased individually by one school district, it often foregoes group discount rates but maintains its selectivity ability. Membership in a purchasing consortium provides excellent cost benefits but disallows the option of specific brand or quality selection.

**Competitors**

Competition in the market place is usually easy to recognize and reckon with. The makers of Crest Toothpaste know who their competition is and can devise strategies to counter the effects on their profit. The concept of competition in the public sector is not as easily recognized. A district's competition can come from private schools, other public schools which can pay teachers higher salaries, special interest groups, tele-
vision, drug exploiters, public attitudes, etc. It is important for a district to recognize with whom or what in its environment it must compete to maintain its current position.

**Regulatory Agencies**

These agencies can directly impact upon the functioning of a school district. Regulatory agencies can dictate policy, legislate mandates, inspect facilities, supervise specific programs, establish standards, etc. A district must maintain a delicate balance between compliance and autonomy. In addition to a district developing awareness of those agencies with regulatory power, it should be able to rank their potential power and establish appropriate relationships.
Comparison of Superintendents' Perceptions of Their Task Environment

The superintendents of the school districts surveyed, were asked to identify the following components of their districts' environment: the product or output of its schools, its customers, the types of resources upon which it is dependent, who or what is in competition with the district, what regulatory agencies impact upon the district, and what are the most important elements in the environment. Each response was given a 1 or 10 rating based on how close it corresponded to our theoretical model. The results of this comparison are displayed in Table 7, which includes the percentage of successful levy passage over the past ten years for each category of school district.

There are three categories of districts with a significant history of successful levy passage. In Category One, 80% of the districts had successful levy passage, 80% for Category Two and Category Four had 75%. No special pattern emerges from the ranking of superintendents' responses except on two questions: "Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?" and "Upon what types of resources is your school system dependent?" The three categories of districts with the highest levy passage have the highest percent of superintendents' responses with a rating of ten. We cannot draw any statistically validated conclusions from this, but it raises the question about possible correlation between the perceptions of superintendents about specific components of the districts' task environment and the districts' successful negotiation with that task environment. In general, the superintendents did not exhibit an insightful understanding about the components of their districts' task environments and sources of dependency.
Comparison of Superintendents' Perception of Their Task Environment

Categories of School Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Supts. Response Rated Ten</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>Seven</th>
<th>Eight</th>
<th>Nine</th>
<th>Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy Passage</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number Six Elements in the Environment</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number Three Types of Resources Dependent Upon</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number One Product of School 10 - Specific</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number Two Customers of School 10 - Specific</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number Four Competition with School 10 - Any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Number Five Regulatory Agencies 10 - 3 or more</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ranking of Responses to Part III
Superintendents' Perceptions

**Question One**
What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General response</th>
<th>Specific response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Types of students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Two**
Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General response</th>
<th>Specific response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population, citizens, employers</td>
<td>Colleges, industry, military</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question Three**
Upon what types of resources is your school system dependent?

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Varied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question Four**
Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Any response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question Five**
What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 types of agency</th>
<th>Multiple agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Question Six**
Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple response</th>
<th>Complex response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual, parents, community</td>
<td>Power groups, church, business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</td>
<td>good citizens with skills to get along in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table entries are placeholders and should be replaced with actual responses as per the study's requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>education for life, college &amp; work</strong></td>
<td>college &amp; trade schools, industry business</td>
<td>people, students booster organizations</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education, state legislative courts</td>
<td>local citizens, local business &amp; industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>service to our students &amp; to the community</strong></td>
<td>primarily students but the whole community benefits</td>
<td>local &amp; state financial support human resources</td>
<td>other school districts - parochial and private schools</td>
<td>H.E.W., E.P.A., State Dept. of Education, North Central</td>
<td>Family, church, community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>our youngsters - prepared for a vocation or technical school or college</strong></td>
<td>our taxpayers, particularly parents, are purchasing these services through their taxes</td>
<td>a large industry in our city, continued community growth &amp; prosperity, continued inventories in industry, good personnel</td>
<td>a J.V.S., two special schools in our 4 county area</td>
<td>Spec. Ed. services, local court system, State &amp; Federal bureau agencies</td>
<td>home &amp; parents, peer relationships, church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>youth prepared for acceptance into our modern society</strong></td>
<td>fields of education &amp; industry are the prime customers with a small segment going into farming</td>
<td>local industry, state, federal, real estate</td>
<td>government taxes</td>
<td>state &amp; federal mandates with no financial support</td>
<td>parents, religious activities, recreation, education, government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>educated youth &amp; understanding adults</strong></td>
<td>whole community</td>
<td>money-competent personnel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>state &amp; federal government</td>
<td>do not understand government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>to help individuals achieve personal success and to help them contribute to the adult society</strong></td>
<td>students &amp; adult society</td>
<td>financial support recognition by the community of the need for the services</td>
<td>politicians, legislators, all state agencies that compete for state funding</td>
<td>mandates of state legislature w/o funding, Title IX</td>
<td>state &amp; federal legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>education</strong></td>
<td>district pupils &amp; residents</td>
<td>money &amp; people</td>
<td>for money-other tax units</td>
<td>federal &amp; state units of government</td>
<td>community leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a young adult who is acceptable in society; one with the skills necessary for continued learning; one with the understanding necessary for living within this confusing environment and with knowledge of how the society may be altered</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>parents that are not too upset with public education; taxpayers willing to support public education at all levels; including higher education upon which we are dependent for the human resources necessary to staff the entire process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

#### Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Who or what do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</th>
<th>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</th>
<th>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</th>
<th>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</th>
<th>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</th>
<th>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent students that are employable &amp; go to any university in the county</td>
<td>families</td>
<td>local &amp; state tax dollars</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>we need local control, freedom of choice</td>
<td>a good community, family, control of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals who are capable of going into either industry or higher education &amp; being successful</td>
<td>colleges, business representing the community &amp; society as a whole</td>
<td>real estate taxes &amp; community support</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>federal &amp; state governments, local government to a lesser degree</td>
<td>parents, the community &amp; the social structure of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our district meets state &amp; North Central Assoc. standards &amp; beyond for our graduates</td>
<td>all of our citizenry-students first, then tax payers</td>
<td>W.P. AF Base, PL 874 impacted aid</td>
<td>we have no competition per se, although all communities have problems getting local tax dollars</td>
<td>Federal &amp; State government</td>
<td>general attitude of public for &amp; about our school district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education of pupils</td>
<td>pupils &amp; their parents</td>
<td>skilled &amp; non-skilled support personnel (bus drivers, custodians, cooks)</td>
<td>St. Louis Parochial School</td>
<td>Ohio Dept. of Education</td>
<td>social mores of local public &amp; attitudes &amp; beliefs of public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generally college prep students</td>
<td>universities</td>
<td>tremendous community support</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>legislature,</td>
<td>a supportive community, responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with high expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>auditor's office,</td>
<td>state legislature, responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H.E.W., courts</td>
<td>state government, Federal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated students</td>
<td>society in general,</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>although a small % of our students</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>&amp; agencies who assist rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who are able to pursue a variety</td>
<td>institutions of higher learning, vocational &amp; technical schools, employers-both private &amp; public</td>
<td>financial resources from local, state &amp; federal sources, quality teaching, administrative &amp; non-cert. staff, buildings to carry out teaching &amp; administrative tasks, educational materials</td>
<td>attend private parochial schools this is not considered to be serious competition</td>
<td>Federal Gov't &amp; agencies</td>
<td>hinder progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of paths once leaving the district:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State legislature &amp; state agencies Courts-local, state &amp; federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) on to a 4 or 2 year college, 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrance into a vocational or technical program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) entrance into a specific job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience, and be successful in that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good citizens</td>
<td>the total population</td>
<td>property tax</td>
<td>parochial schools</td>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with a general education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young people</td>
<td>total society</td>
<td>people (pupils, staff) &amp; funds</td>
<td>no one - there are many who complement us</td>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>parents of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ready for the next phase of their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Dept. of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education for students K-12</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>community support</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td>local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Dept. of Education, Federal Government</td>
<td>local power structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students who exhibit competent</td>
<td>labor force in the community &amp; immediate area</td>
<td>state funding of special &amp; vocational programs</td>
<td>other neighboring public school</td>
<td>Bureau of Unemployment</td>
<td>a viable recreational program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance of the basic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>districts</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>and social welfare organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a graduate prepared for further academic training vocational employment or constructive citizen</td>
<td>total society</td>
<td>a generous personal property valuation</td>
<td>no single thing, television for student time and interests, other agencies for financial resources</td>
<td>OSHA Special Ed. OCR, HEW</td>
<td>the home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students who are ready for the next phase of their lives</td>
<td>the entire community but more specifically students and parents</td>
<td>public confidence—this brings us money &amp; good will necessary to offer our program</td>
<td>we have no real competition, private schools try to compete for students</td>
<td>all of them, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, State Dept. of Education, HEW, Dept. of Energy, Title IX</td>
<td>the family, local &amp; state government, service clubs, professional groups, social clubs, the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduates</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>financial support</td>
<td>federal taxes state taxes</td>
<td>Federal State</td>
<td>the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hopefully a thinking student, one who also has a respect for others &amp; their property</td>
<td>various employers all over the U.S.</td>
<td>people in the community</td>
<td>T.V., inconsiderate parents &amp; students, the lure of the market place</td>
<td>H.E.W. Courts NAACP Civil Liberties Groups</td>
<td>the home parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

### Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Three</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens prepared to function in an adult world</td>
<td>general job market</td>
<td>state support</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>low income population, lack of job opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>State of Ohio and U.S.A.</td>
<td>state funding</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>State &amp; Federal Government</td>
<td>the family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children</td>
<td>community of citizens</td>
<td>financial, personnel</td>
<td>poor judicial system</td>
<td>state legislators State Dept. of Education Office of Civil Rights Federal agencies</td>
<td>don't understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:**

**Perceptions of the Superintendent**

### Category Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</th>
<th>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</th>
<th>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</th>
<th>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</th>
<th>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</th>
<th>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational experiences</td>
<td>Students &amp; adults</td>
<td>Money, cooperation, interest</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>State legislature, federal courts, Congress, State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Public interest and involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who are prepared to enter the mainstream of our society as desirable citizens</td>
<td>The labor market, professional and semi-professional occupations, service occupations, etc.</td>
<td>Parental &amp; other citizens' loyal support and concerns for education. Student enthusiasm, support and willingness to participate. Taxpayers willing to pay the bill and a good tax base. Adult participation &amp; willingness to help where and when needed.</td>
<td>Private/religious schools</td>
<td>Ohio legislature The courts Federal agencies</td>
<td>Parental belief in stability of the family. Rural environment-agriculture. A very strong religious influence in the district - Swiss Mennonites-Amish. Provincialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students capable of continuing their education through formal education, tech training or work, citizens more capable of making good decisions about business, life &amp; family</td>
<td>the community, state &amp; world</td>
<td>state support, some reasonable tax basis locally (there is no industry)</td>
<td>welfare agencies &amp; other similar programs which erode support - special interest groups seeking to rob children of the educational process through taking support money for frills or introducing unnecessary programs</td>
<td>Public Law 94-142 &amp; Federal 504 regulations. Bureaucracy &amp; the associated reports, paperwork, etc. instigated to prove we have or have not cheated</td>
<td>the home churches society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students with salable/trainable skills</td>
<td>society in general</td>
<td>state support, real estate tax, residential, commercial, agricultural, personal property tax</td>
<td>Federal National Forest - takes more land yearly. The Welfare Program</td>
<td>Federal &amp; State Agencies, local interest groups, Teacher Union</td>
<td>The home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a well-rounded student who has learned to learn to the fullest of his/her capability</td>
<td>parents/taxpayer</td>
<td>property taxes, state foundation</td>
<td>new private church schools (several) have opened in our area</td>
<td>State of Ohio - legislature U.S. Government HEW, EPA</td>
<td>Church, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>professions &amp; industry</td>
<td>students and money</td>
<td>birth control private schools lack of money</td>
<td>legislators Governor personal tax laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children who are prepared to enter the work field or college Education of youngsters is an investment</td>
<td>community, state &amp; nation, colleges &amp; the business and industrial complexes</td>
<td>students, parents who care &amp; friends to operate the schools</td>
<td>the media - the drug operators - business that exploits youngsters</td>
<td>State &amp; Federal Government Courts</td>
<td>the family, big business and government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above average achievement, those who attend the vocational school are able to become employed</td>
<td>State of Ohio</td>
<td>State &amp; local funds</td>
<td>Spec. Ed. laws Ohio Legislature, State Board of Education</td>
<td>parents &amp; churches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>progress/learning</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>all school districts survive</td>
<td>attitudes</td>
<td>legislature</td>
<td>electric media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated citizens</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>financial, personnel, facilities</td>
<td>for what?</td>
<td>court system</td>
<td>transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ready to accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unions</td>
<td>value systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the responsibilities of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living in a democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all of the graduates as</td>
<td>higher education</td>
<td>local &amp; state resources</td>
<td>negative influences on the</td>
<td>state &amp; federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated</td>
<td>employers</td>
<td></td>
<td>students, agencies which</td>
<td>mandates/laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>obtain funds diverted from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>needed education resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

#### Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category Six</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>education of each individual</strong></td>
<td>the individual and society</td>
<td>local tax dollars schoolage individuals</td>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>Federal Gov't Legislation Courts</td>
<td>taxpayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>the youth of our district who attend our schools - our goal is to provide each of them the opportunity to learn &amp; to expand their knowledge in their area of interest</strong></td>
<td>this community, society in general</td>
<td>money, parental support</td>
<td>parochial groups who want to isolate and protect their children from social contact found in public schools - deomogues who want to build a school in their own image</td>
<td>all of these agencies serve a purpose but are often far removed from practicality in so far as school operation is concerned</td>
<td>family &amp; societal influences - television, music, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>students who have a comprehensive educational background that qualifies them to enter into the general labor market &amp; receive further</strong></td>
<td>the customers of our school system's product would be the total society - the industries, the businesses, the schools, professions</td>
<td>first, we have to have in-people who need an education and secondly we have to have the financial resources to fund all parts of the program - in our</td>
<td>I feel there is no competition to our school district. There is no other institution that is capable or even trying to do what the public schools</td>
<td>I don't feel that there are any unnecessary restrictions upon our school system today. All the restrictions placed upon us from the State</td>
<td>The home environment of the students and the community in which the students must live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>training within</strong> the individual labor market, or continue on to advanced schooling either technical or degree in preparation for a vocation or a profession. The product should be developed to its fullest potential in the area of academic capability, social growth, physical growth, and develop a knowledge of the economic and governmental systems of our country.</td>
<td><strong>colleges, businesses, armed forces, technical schools, farming</strong></td>
<td>local tax revenue (property tax) and state foundation funds - taxes (income, sales, etc.)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td><strong>State legislature</strong></td>
<td><strong>the local people are very conservative but the people who generally come forward are good workers and have been very helpful</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>academic trained</strong></td>
<td><strong>well adjusted graduates</strong></td>
<td><strong>competent teachers, team management, individuality, money</strong></td>
<td><strong>welfare, unemployment</strong></td>
<td><strong>none</strong></td>
<td><strong>job market news media</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>citizenship</strong></td>
<td>Cincinnati area industry</td>
<td>financial (state &amp; local)</td>
<td>welfare department for state monies</td>
<td>federal programs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general education</td>
<td>entire community</td>
<td>taxes</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>state &amp; federal law</td>
<td>T.V., tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students fairly well prepared</td>
<td>the local tax payers and residents of the district</td>
<td>local tax base &amp; substantial state aid</td>
<td>no one</td>
<td>Federal Gov't State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>the family and church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens can leave and be a productive and contributing human being to our society</td>
<td>the citizen of this state and nation</td>
<td>the support of the people to continue financing this school</td>
<td>The federal government taxes which continue to rise with inflation while local taxes do not. Also the federal government's deficit spending.</td>
<td>Federal &amp; State legislatures - passing too many pieces of legislation not needed</td>
<td>the environment in which our students exist after school hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupils, the majority of whom have been educated sufficiently to enter the world of work or pursue additional education and training which is felt to be needed</td>
<td>employers, universities, colleges, technical schools, society in general</td>
<td>pupils, parents, teachers, money</td>
<td>Forces dictated by society</td>
<td>Federal &amp; State Government accrediting groups, society in general</td>
<td>Family, church, peer group pressures and influences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizens</td>
<td>country &amp; state</td>
<td>local &amp; state funding</td>
<td>welfare, low or no tax groups, private</td>
<td>State legislature</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supportive attitude for schools</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a well prepared productive citizen</td>
<td>all residents of this community</td>
<td>Very interested parents in our program.</td>
<td>other public agencies supported by the tax</td>
<td>State legislative mandates - more than half</td>
<td>Strong church groups in this community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive voters (parents &amp; non-parents)</td>
<td>dollar (competitive to some small degree)</td>
<td>of which are unnecessary. Federal program</td>
<td>Several supportive service clubs. Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mandates - all of which are not needed.</td>
<td>public service groups - volunteer fire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>department &amp; medical rescue units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good kids</td>
<td>entire district</td>
<td>people &amp; money</td>
<td>no one</td>
<td>HEW</td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-sufficient student who upon graduation</td>
<td>colleges, universities, manufacturers,</td>
<td>successful farming</td>
<td>all other schools</td>
<td>State of Ohio</td>
<td>churches, law enforcement agencies and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is capable of continuing their education or</td>
<td>farmers, all businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>securing employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic-achievement citizenship</td>
<td>local business armed forces</td>
<td>money</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EPA: Federal Government</td>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college preparation and vocational trained</td>
<td>colleges and universities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a well-rounded individual</td>
<td>the future</td>
<td>federal, state funds, local monies</td>
<td>the growing concern by the public for</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education Legislative</td>
<td>the good will of the taxpayers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quality education - mainly the private</td>
<td>actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sector of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a student with a good general education</td>
<td>local community &amp; industries</td>
<td>industry</td>
<td>noncertified or noncredited private schools</td>
<td>State Dept. &amp; Federal mandates</td>
<td>parents of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people useful to the community &amp; themselves, an outstanding government program is an example of this</td>
<td>employers who will be hiring our graduates - it is hoped the country as a whole will benefit by informed citizenry</td>
<td>passing of levies - a growing community supporting those levies, a very interested citizen group who are very interested in school policy</td>
<td>perhaps the private schools</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education North Central</td>
<td>Strong voter support, interested parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinking citizenry</td>
<td>the nation</td>
<td>money &amp; students drugs, alcohol, T.V.</td>
<td>State of Ohio U.S. Gov't and all regulatory agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

#### Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Seven</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **the best possible education we can provide to the students** | the Delphos community or society in general |
| **we hope students are in control of emotions and have some kind of idea of what they want to do in life, we hope we have prepared them to think and to handle different situations** | society — if they can function in an appropriate manner they will be able to get along |
| **good citizens** | community |

| **we hope students are in control of emotions and have some kind of idea of what they want to do in life, we hope we have prepared them to think and to handle different situations** | we have a sincere value for education |
| **the best possible education we can provide to the students** | none |

| **local taxpayer** | State & Federal Government |
| **state & federal government** | it seems the taxpayer — it's the only place they can say no — also politics plays a big part |

| **the best possible education we can provide to the students** | The Union-OEA |
| **we hope students are in control of emotions and have some kind of idea of what they want to do in life, we hope we have prepared them to think and to handle different situations** | |

| **good citizens** | Federal & State Government regulations OEA |

| **the best possible education we can provide to the students** | |
| **we hope students are in control of emotions and have some kind of idea of what they want to do in life, we hope we have prepared them to think and to handle different situations** | |

| **good citizens** | |

| **the best possible education we can provide to the students** | |
| **we hope students are in control of emotions and have some kind of idea of what they want to do in life, we hope we have prepared them to think and to handle different situations** | |

| **good citizens** | |
## Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

### Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Eight</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a mixture of vocational, technical and college prepared students</td>
<td>Van Wert County area</td>
<td>property tax farm land and residential</td>
<td>inflation</td>
<td>Federal Gov't. &amp; State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizens with broad basic education, sense of community pride, understanding of &quot;work&quot; ethic</td>
<td>local business &amp; industry</td>
<td>tax dollars community support of all programs, both curricular and extra-curricular value of education</td>
<td>outside organization in community, non-educational state agencies</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education Dept. of Industrial Relations EPA</td>
<td>local government local churches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated boys and girls</td>
<td>parents and citizens of district</td>
<td>youth</td>
<td>no one</td>
<td>EPA State Government Federal Gov't. EPA and industrial relations personnel who inspect our facilities</td>
<td>the public support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outstanding graduates that go on to better things, good public relations that have cause for strong support of schools financially</td>
<td>colleges and farm related employment</td>
<td>good teachers and farm support</td>
<td>Christian Schools The support of people who feel the freedom permitted is a lack of discipline</td>
<td>EPA and industrial relations personnel who inspect our facilities</td>
<td>the public support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students able to meet the needs of society with necessary skills</td>
<td>Western Ohio</td>
<td>State aid</td>
<td>State Board</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young men and women prepared to continue education or enter the world of work</td>
<td>college, technical schools, business and industry</td>
<td>pupils tax dollars generated locally and state financing</td>
<td>other political subdivisions competing for the tax foller, massive amounts of state and federal monies being diverted from rural areas to large metropolitan regions</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>basic education</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>industry</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic knowledge, social &amp; entertainment, value for nation, physical development</td>
<td>students, parents state, community, nation-world</td>
<td>students parents building texts-supplies</td>
<td>T.V. World of work</td>
<td>Federal &amp; State Government &amp; their many branches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>educated students</th>
<th>business and industry and community</th>
<th>money, community, support</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>State legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>young adults ready for the next step in their lives</td>
<td>parents &amp; other local residents while in training, then employers and schools of higher education (most employers are the local farms and industries w/in 30 miles)</td>
<td>income from taxes - local &amp; state, support of local residents in all ways, sufficient pupils to operate schools economically, enough properly prepared educators to staff</td>
<td>other ways citizens can spend their money that appeal more to them than paying sufficient taxes to run schools, jobs that lure students before they have completed a desired amount of train-</td>
<td>State Dept. of Education State fire marshal State auditor County Board of Health Dept. of Industrial Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the schools, enough non-certified employees with sufficient skills to do the required work at the rates of pay we can afford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other school districts that can pay higher salaries which get better teachers to work for them and make those who stay here dissatisfied.
## Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

### Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Nine</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong></td>
<td>What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>Upon what resources is your school dependent?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more middle class citizens</td>
<td>total population of country</td>
<td>good staff, long tenured &amp; supportive board, long tenured &amp; dedicated principals a supportive community</td>
<td>welfare</td>
<td>state legislature, H.E.W.</td>
<td>the homes and parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a better educated young citizen</td>
<td>our total citizenry</td>
<td>desire of public to want education - a staff who senses the need of the students, money to get the job done</td>
<td>we may have competition for the students' time with commercial businesses - T.V., movies, etc. - unions who do not have the student at heart but have a &quot;to hell with the student attitude but demand the education dollars</td>
<td>legislatures who are more interested in political power than in doing what they know is best, judges who wish to cater rather than help the whole educational process</td>
<td>the home, then the church, then the school - in that order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful citizens</td>
<td>various employers</td>
<td>taxes</td>
<td>village government</td>
<td>State legislature and Federal Gov't</td>
<td>energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth ready to function in a complex society</td>
<td>state, national and local government - industry society</td>
<td>support of local taxpayers industry</td>
<td>private educational institutions</td>
<td>State legislature, H.E.W.</td>
<td>public opinion &amp; higher education such as universities, preparing teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Actual Responses of School Districts by Category to Part III:

Perceptions of the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Who or what do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon what resources is your school system's product?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?</td>
<td>What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?</td>
<td>Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total learning program for students and residents</td>
<td>community residents</td>
<td>tax duplicate</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business, industry and government</td>
<td>parents, public support both financially &amp; personally, student population, instructional personnel from higher education, classified personnel for support services, manufacturing &amp; business institutions</td>
<td>other tax-supported agencies, but only financially</td>
<td>Local Board of Education, State of Ohio, Ohio Legislature, Federal Government, State Dept. of Education, Local agencies</td>
<td>supportive public fiscally sound government, successful business &amp; industry, strong citizen belief in the value of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals capable of: furthering their education; entering the job market; pursuing a livelihood of some type</td>
<td>colleges &amp; universities business &amp; industry military services</td>
<td>personal property taxes, State foundation program</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Federal Gov't State legislature pressure groups of various description</td>
<td>the home, parents working and not devoting sufficient time to &quot;parenting&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ohio Superintendents' Identification of Resources and Their Procurement

Twenty Ohio superintendents were interviewed for a companion study (Ogawa, 1979) and were asked to identify the major resources upon which their district is dependent and to describe how they obtain those resources. (Only seventeen of the responses were usable.)

The criteria used to select the superintendents (as explained on page 42 in Chapter III) was designed to insure that the superintendents interviewed were representative of all Ohio superintendents. Their responses are summarized in light of the resource-dependency model we have utilized in this study.

The majority of the superintendents interviewed did not have an in-depth perspective about their resource needs and most had not developed proactive sophisticated means to obtain the resources upon which their districts are dependent.
Summary of Superintendents' Responses

Upon what major resources does your district need to function?

a. What are the sources for these resources?

b. What do you have to do to get the necessary resources?

c. Who do you use to get these resources?

d. What do you have to exchange to get these necessary resources?

The majority of superintendents' response to the initial question exhibited an unfamiliarity with the concept of resources. Superintendent X's response typified the others, "I am not certain what that question is about, what do you mean by resources?" Once pushed, all but two superintendents identified money as the major resource needed by the district. "Money, money is the important critical ingredient - with it we can provide a good program and good staff and sharp people who perform."

(Superintendent S) A good qualified staff was identified as the second most important resource; a minority added buildings and materials to the list. Only two superintendents of the seventeen questioned recognized resources not directly related to the operation of the system. "With all the money in the world you still need strong personnel, principals, a school board that works together and understands their functions, an involved community, especially a strong PTA." (Superintendent L) "I am going to take the term resources to mean any characteristic we would need to have the type of school district we want. I can't say money - we've done too well without it. We need a professionally minded staff, innovative people in every position of leadership, a citizenry who supports your schools, and a friendly press." (Superintendent B)

Of the superintendents questioned, most perceived critical resources
as those tangible factors immediately obvious to them in their daily work: money, staff and buildings. The majority did not view the system interacting in an environment which also provides requisite resources: students to attend their school, citizens who support their system, organizations which utilize their product (and thus lend legitimacy), legal agencies which define and support their organization.

Questions a through d were not always asked precisely due to the open ended nature of the interview process. Each superintendent was asked to identify their approach to procuring necessary resources; some talked only in terms of techniques used to pass levies, while others focused on communication with the public. "I try and keep the people involved and informed in what's going on in the programs and then try and get the yes votes out at levy time." (Superintendent C) "We pass levies by convincing the community they need it, the money will be used in the right ways - communication is the key - getting the word out to people - getting their confidence - trust - emphasize the benefits to them." (Superintendent N)

Commensurate with their previous responses, the two superintendents who viewed the school system within its contextual setting, were the only two who perceived their role in proactive terms in regard to the procurement of resources for their district. The majority of superintendents responded to events or pressures as they arose, or used a shot gun strategy to communicate with and win over the undefined "requisite others."

"We work closely with our State Representative and Senator to present our needs, we work through the state organization to make sure we get a fair share of the pie at the state level." (Superintendent L) Contrast
this proactive response with that of Superintendent C (who represents the majority's viewpoint), "There's not much we can do to influence the State Legislature, we try and keep informed but I guess politics are politics with a lot of wheeling and dealing and we don't have time for that;" or that of Superintendent N, "We are completely at the mercy of the State Legislature, only the large cities bother to lobby, we just don't do it."
Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

Statement of the Problem

The study was designed to create categories of school districts based on their definition of domain, identify the task environment and sources of dependency for each category, compare these findings with the perceptions of the districts' superintendents and the history of their levy passage, and finally, to explore the understandings of a representative group of Ohio superintendents concerning the identification and procurement of resources required for survival.

Procedure

The study was composed of four sequential sections. For the first task, the identification of categories of Ohio school districts based on their domains, data were collected from the Ohio State Department of Education and from a written questionnaire of 200 randomly selected Ohio public school superintendents.

For each category of Ohio public school districts, the particulars of their task environment was identified, based on demographic data collected from a variety of sources. (Ohio State Department of Education, Chamber of Commerce, Superintendent's questionnaire, etc.)
Part Three of the study is an application of Pfeffer's and Bobbitt's concepts of resource-dependence to the identified categories of Ohio Public school districts in an attempt to theoretically locate the different types of resource-dependence created between a school district's domain and its task environment.

The final section of the study attempts to raise possible hypothesis for further investigation. The history of levy passage and the perceptions of the districts' superintendents concerning their task environment and dependencies were compared and questions were raised about possible inter-relationships. A sample of Ohio superintendents was interviewed to identify their understandings of the organization's resource needs.

Findings

Ten categories of school districts were identified based on the characteristics of the district's domain. The components of the task environment were described for each category. An $X^2$ nonparametric test was performed to determine whether differences exist between categories of school districts in relation to their task environment and passage of levies. A significant difference was found between categories of school districts in relation to their population served, their suppliers of resources, their competition and their passage of levies.

The perception of these districts' superintendents about components of the task environment and dependency were ranked 1 or 10 based on how close they corresponded to our theoretical model. The results of these ratings were compared to the history of levy passage and questions were raised about possible correlations between a superintendent's understanding of the district's task environment and areas of dependency and
his/her ability to successfully negotiate with that environment. The final component of the study consists of a summary of 20 Ohio superintendents' responses to questions concerning the resources needed by their district. The majority of superintendents did not exhibit an indepth understanding of resources beyond the obvious of money and teachers.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations are listed for consideration in regard to the conclusions of the study which follow.

The limitations of this study are threefold:

1. Theoretical Framework
2. Generalization
3. Data Collection Pitfalls

The categorization of Ohio School Systems and description of their task environments are limited by the theoretical constructs used to frame the data collection. That is, the answers received are to an extent limited by the questions asked. Using Levine and White's model of organization's domain focuses the study on their specific characterizations of domain and limits the inclusion of other factors and characterizations.

Caution must be used in generalizing results from this study to school systems in other states. Questions for further investigation or research will be generated from this study, no attempts will be made to generalize to similar situations or systems in other states.

All social research techniques are subject to limitations. Perceptual distortion, modification of experience through hindsight, inadequacies of our sense-organs, the interdependence of observation with inference, untruthful responses to questions, (Madge, 1935), are all problems with which the researcher must contend.
Conclusions

Taking into consideration the limitations outlined above, the following conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study.

1. The concept of domain appears useful for the analysis of school districts. Since the domain of an organization consists of the specific goals it decides to pursue and the functions it undertakes to implement its goals, the domains of school districts provide a meaningful methodology for the clustering of similar school districts. Rather than grouping schools by size or location, the grouping by domain clusters schools by the definition and enactment of their goals. Although for the purposes of this study the categories of school districts were used as a basis to explore resource-dependency, they can be used as the basis for a multitude of studies. The categorizing process allows the researcher the means to funnel a large population of data into neat workable packages.

2. As Thompson concludes in his work on organizations, "...the organization's domain identifies the points at which the organization is dependent on inputs from its environment. The composition of that environment, the location within it of capacities, in turn determine upon whom the organization is dependent." (Thompson 1967:27) The identification of components of the task environment of school districts is a necessary step in determining upon whom they are dependent. Dill's definition of task environment provides a useful approach to the breakdown of school districts' environment. The four elements of that environment, customers, suppliers, of resources, competitors, and regulatory agencies, introduce a different per-
spective from which schools can be analyzed and assessed. We enter
a land of interdependency, of need fulfillment, where the name and
function of an organization hold little meaning without the addition
of its contextual setting. We begin to view a school in terms of
what it can provide, of what it needs to provide, from whom it must
receive support to survive. Once we recognize the elements needed
to continue, we can develop strategies which enable us to deal
effectively with that environment. We may have to redefine our
domain, or alter the perceptions of our task environment to maintain
the balance between power and dependency. Some school districts may
have to redefine the population they serve to include adults and/or
senior citizens as their base of support for the education of six to
eighteen year olds diminishes. Schools, as with all organizations,
do not exist merely because they have done so in the past, they must
continue to provide a useful function and it must be viewed as useful
not by the superintendents of schools but by the elements in the task
environment which provide the inputs and accept the outputs of the
district. "The relationship between an organization and its task
environment is essentially one of exchange, and unless the organi-
zation is judged by those in contact with it as offering something
desirable, it will not receive the inputs necessary for survival."
(Thompson, 1967:28)
A prerequisite to an analysis of the task environment to determine
points of dependency, is the simple recognition of that environment
and the interactive role it plays with the organization.
"...management can adjust and alter the social context surrounding the organization or can facilitate the organization's adjustment to its context. Both activities require understanding the social context and the interrelationship between context and the organization." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:20)

3. Based on the results of analyzing the responses of superintendents to questions exploring their understanding of the task environment (questionnaire data) and the responses given to questions concerning identification of resources (interview data), we conclude that superintendents in Ohio have a very superficial view of their districts' environment and of the resources upon which they are dependent. Therefore, they have not developed effective strategies with which to interact successfully with their task environment. Schools tend to react to their environment, the outcomes of this reaction vary: failed levies, mandated curriculum, school closings, competency testing, legislated standards for special groups, declining enrollment, lack of public support, diminishing image of public schools.

"Organizations may misread interdependence, misinterpret demands, remain committed to past practices, or fail to see the various conflicts in demands." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:84)

4. The usefulness of this study is, therefore, clear. It offers a method which can be used by researchers, superintendents, school boards, etc., to group types of school districts according to their goals and functions. This enables the feasible analysis of a large number of districts. The study also contributes a model borrowed from the field of organizational design, which enables superintendents to identify the specific resources in their task environment upon
which their district is dependent. If the concept of resource-dependence can be understood and embraced by this group of people, superintendents can begin to "manage their organizations in light of a changing environment." Instead of reacting to the effects of change, superintendents can develop strategies to maintain their supply of resources or alter the types of resources they need. They will be able to monitor the important elements of their districts' environment and deal with those components from a position of strength. If the needs of those elements are being met, they will continue to supply the schools with needed resources.

The study also raises a concern about the current abilities of superintendents to function as effective managers of their organizations. If superintendents fail to see their schools as a dependent part of a larger environment, they will also fail to function beyond the role of a school administrator. An administrator merely insures the carrying on of a previously determined set of rules and functions; schools cannot afford to carry on as they have in the past. The task environment of public schools has changed, and schools need leaders with the imagination and integrative skills to maintain the necessary linkage between the two.

Implications

A natural question arises, how can we develop the skills in superintendents which will allow them to become effective managers of their organization and its interrelationship with the environment? A natural answer arises, we must develop more effective educational programs for the development of present and future superintendents. We need to
indicate the institutions of higher learning which credential school principals and superintendents to develop management training programs rather than their current system of allowing a number of disjointed courses to qualify an individual to administer a large, complex organization.

But can we rely upon professors of educational administration to affect these changes? No! They are trapped by their own lack of vision as to the role of the superintendent. They have failed to define this role beyond that of the traditional school administrator. Educational administration has segmented itself away from the field of management science and has in effect, cut off its own circulation, its own ability to see beyond its past.

The owners of public schools, the state legislators, are in the position to alter and redefine the requisite skills of the superintendency. The power to credential superintendents can be used to force universities to develop the courses and types of experiences which will produce managers of schools.

These are times of limited resources; we cannot afford the consequences of ineffective, reactive administration of our schools. Schools should play a vital role in our society, they must not be allowed to become an expendable item that is limited or eliminated as resources continue to grow scarcer. "Problems arise not merely because organizations are dependent on their environment, but because this environment is not dependable." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978:3).

Recommendations For Further Research

1. As stated previously, the categorizing perspective gained through identification of school districts by domain, is a useful means to
organize and then analyze any type of data collected from a large sample of schools. The domain information would be collected in addition to the research issue and would be used to create categories of districts, from which the analysis could proceed.

2. Application of the resource-dependence model to any one of series of organizations allows the investigator to identify the relationship between definition of domain and task environment, and to identify points of current or potential dependencies. This analysis can best be used by the managers of organizations to develop strategies aimed at reducing dependency and uncertainty and increasing decision making authority. The resource-dependence model can also be used as an analysis tool to predict the cost-benefit of a pending decision such as the location of a new organization, redefinition of goals, objectives, product or any major change in policy or structure.

3. The results of further study of the relationship between a superintendent's understanding of the elements of the task environment and the district's successful negotiation with that environment can contribute to the development of management training programs and seminars for superintendents. Regression analysis is a useful statistical tool which could be used to determine the existence and strength of correlation between sensitivity to specific elements in the task environment and the success of that district to interact with that environment. (Success of levy passage was used as one indicator, other indicators of success could also be developed.) The components of a district's task environment could also be
further developed and refined.

4. Each superintendent of schools should apply the resource-dependence model to his/her district to identify sources of dependency and begin developing strategies to insure continued supply of needed resources and/or reduce that dependency. The procedures followed in this study can be duplicated on an individual basis by each district. The superintendent should identify the district's goals and describe how functions are designed to implement those goals. The domain of the district can then be identified by answering the following questions: (1) Who is the population served by the school? (2) What are the services provided by the school? (3) What are the range of products offered? (4) In what environment (cultural, social, economic, political) is it located? The school's domain decides the task environment in which it chooses to function. The superintendent can then fill in the components of that specific environment by identifying the school's customers, its suppliers of resources, its competition and its regulatory agencies. Once the superintendent has collected and organized this data, she/he can begin to identify sources of dependency between the school and its environment. The superintendent can monitor these components in terms of their goals and changing needs and expectations and develop strategies to maintain or alter the nature of their interactions.

5. An interesting study could be done on the characteristics of those school districts (36) which did not cluster. Do they have any commonalities? Do their superintendents perceive the world and their roles any differently? Are these districts any more or less
successful negotiating with their task environment?

**Further Considerations**

All organizations, all organisms, must interact with others outside itself. The identification of the components involved in the interaction provides a clearer focus on the balance between the organization and its environment. It is imperative that the managers of an organization are cognizant of the factors, the ingredients their organization needs to carry out its function. The continued procurement of those resources is a major responsibility of managers, they, therefore, must develop methods by which they can identify those resources. Once identified, managers need to develop strategies to insure the certainty of resource attainment. If a firm uses pig iron as a raw material in its production of car door handles, the firm's managers must maintain the continued supply of that resource. They must continually assess market conditions and events and develop contingency procurement plans to counteract the effect of strikes, weather disasters, etc.

In times of scarce resources or changing customer values and needs, the managers of a firm often have to redefine the goals and thus domain of their organization. If a product is no longer desired, if a type of skilled person or raw material is no longer available, the firm must redefine its purpose, carve out a new domain, to continue in existence. A good example is the March of Dimes. When a cure for polio was discovered, did the March of Dimes close up shop? No, they redefined their goal and thus domain and are now dedicated to aid in the prevention of birth defects.

Superintendents of public schools must develop the skills and
abilities to become effective managers of their organization. The conclusions drawn from this study indicate that Ohio Superintendents have a superficial understanding of their districts' resource-dependence. They know they need money and teachers and buildings. Some even include the children who attend the schools. Ohio superintendents know they are dependent upon a vaguely described public or society. But this appears to be the level of their understanding. They do not think in terms of their organization being dependent upon particular resources which are crucial to the continued functioning of their schools. Without this basic perceptual cognition, superintendents will continue to react to changes in their task environment which affect their ability to function. If you do not recognize the concept of dependency, then you cannot develop strategy to lessen or maintain that dependency. If you have not recognized the changing expectations of your district's customers and redesigned the school's curriculum to meet those altered expectations, then you will be caught short when large numbers of your graduates cannot find permanent jobs or flunk out of college, or cannot balance their checkbooks.

Superintendents are limited by the historical definition of what a school is and what it is supposed to do. They assume the continued existence of these institutions and have not contributed to the expansion and growth of public schools. Superintendents must learn to embrace the challenge of maintaining their schools as viable innovative entities, as part of a larger environment which is turbulent and dynamic. As children between the ages of 6 and 18 decline in number, should superintendents react as they have been doing and close schools? No, they can redefine the concept of student: expand it to meet the growing needs of working parents and include preschool children, expand it to meet
the interests and problems of the elderly, expand it to meet the needs of former dropouts, expand it to include people returning to the labor force. Public schools are capable of growth and expansion rather than decline, if only their managers could develop the perceptions and then skills to manage their organization as an integral part of a larger, dynamic environment.
APPENDIX A
A QUESTIONNAIRE

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

(Please generalize concerning school district characteristics allowing for differences among individual schools within your district.)

1. Our school district offers an academic program for grades:
   - [ ] Pre-school
   - [ ] K-12
   - [ ] K-Adult
   - [ ] 1-12
   - [ ] 1-Adult
   - [ ] Pre-school-12
   - [ ] Adult

2. The majority (over 50%) of students attending our public schools represent a similar (homogeneous) socio-cultural background.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3. Our school district provides the following services to our students and community:
   (check as many as applicable)
   - [ ] instruction
   - [ ] counseling
   - [ ] meals
   - [ ] recreation
   - [ ] certification
   - [ ] meeting facilities
   - [ ] summer program
   - [ ] entertainment
   - [ ] others

4. Our school district is located in a(n):
   - [ ] urban setting
   - [ ] suburban setting
   - [ ] rural setting

5. The majority (over 50%) of students attending our public schools come from families representative of:
   - [ ] upper middle class background
   - [ ] mixed background
   - [ ] lower class background
   - [ ] middle class background
   (please specify approximate breakdown)

6. Our school district offers the following range of products to our students:
   (check as many as applicable)
   - [ ] academic education
   - [ ] special education
   - [ ] drivers education
   - [ ] technical education
   - [ ] extracurricular activities
   - [ ] athletic program
   - [ ] enrichment activities (art, music, etc.)
   - [ ] others

II. INSTRUCTION RELATED CHARACTERISTICS

1. Averaged over the past five years, approximately what percent of the district's graduates:
   - [ ] % directly entered the job market
   - [ ] % entered a two or four year college degree program
   - [ ] % entered a technical or vocational training program
   - [ ] % other (welfare, unemployment, child care, etc.)
2. Approximately what percent of the school district's certified personnel graduated from a college or university:

______% within the State of Ohio

of those attending Ohio schools, approximately what percent graduated from:

______% private college

______% state college

3. Approximately what percent of the non-certified personnel are:

______% recruited locally

______% recruited from across the State of Ohio

______% recruited from outside the State of Ohio

4. The majority (over 50%) of certified personnel in the school district are members of a:

☐ professional organization

☐ educational union

☐ no organized group

5. The majority (over 50%) of the noncertified personnel in the school district are members of a:

☐ trade union

☐ professional organization

☐ no organized group

6. Of the district's total budget, approximately what percent of the money is:

______% generated locally

______% received from the State of Ohio

______% received from the Federal Government

7. The majority (over 50%) of teaching related supplies and materials are:

☐ purchased through a central purchasing agent or organization

☐ are purchased individually by the local school district

☐ other (please specify) ________________________________

8. Approximately what percent of the district's school aged residents attend a private school? ______%

Of those students attending private school, approximately what percent attend:

______% religious private school

______% non-sectarian private school

9. The school district(s) within reasonable travel distance from our school district accept nonresident tuition students.

☐ yes

☐ no

10. Approximately what percent (if any) of your district's school aged residents attend a public school on a tuition basis? ______%

11. Over the past ten years, how many school levies have been put before the voters? ______

12. How many of these have passed? ______

JUST ONE MORE PAGE!
III. PERSONAL PERCEPTIONS

1. What do you consider to be the product or output of public schools in your district?

2. Who or what do you consider to be the customers of your school system's product?

3. Upon what types of resources is your school district dependent? (What are the essential ingredients without which the school district could not survive?)

4. Who or what do you consider to be in competition with your school district?

5. What regulatory agencies dictate, impact upon, or in some way restrict the functioning of your school system?

6. Who or what do you consider to be the most important elements in the environment outside the school system itself?
Dear Superintendent

My name is Abby Hughes, I am completing my doctorate in educational administration at The Ohio State University. For my dissertation research I am examining certain characteristics of school districts and the related perceptions of the districts' superintendents. Using a random selection process, 50 Ohio school districts have been selected as the sample for this study, and your school district is one of the samples!

I would greatly appreciate you taking the time (approximately 15 minutes) to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. I am sure that your time is precious to you and questionnaires are often time consuming and boring. But this one is different. It is short, precise, and interesting (at least I think so!).

Although Part I and II can easily be answered by an assistant superintendent and/or high school guidance counselor, Part III is designed for your personal attention.

While it may not be of great concern to you, your anonymity will be protected in any and all reporting of the study.

Since I will be analyzing the data in a few weeks, I look forward to receiving your responses. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Abby Hughes

P.S. For your convenience, return address and postage are stamped on the back of the questionnaire. Just staple it and drop it in the mail!
Dear Superintendent!

Recently I sent you a questionnaire asking for your description and perceptions of some of the characteristics of your district. As yet, I have not received your completed questionnaire. Perhaps you forgot about it. Or, perhaps you did not forget, but did not have the time or interest to complete it. Can't blame you: I know that you are busy and that questionnaires are a bother.

Nevertheless, won't you please help? In the pretests the questionnaire took an average of fifteen minutes to complete. I sincerely hope that you will find a few moments to fill it out and return it.

Thanks again for your time and trouble.

Sincerely,
Dear Superintendent:

Well, here I am again, taking up your time with my darn survey on characteristics of school districts in Ohio. Frankly, it takes a lot of nerve on my part to send another questionnaire after I've already bothered you before. However, I feel this is important, so here goes... and hopefully you won't be too irritating about it. Here are a few points of information.

1. Response to the survey up to this point has been extremely encouraging. Over 60% of the people have returned the questionnaire.

2. Only a few of the types of school districts surveyed have less than a 40% response rate. Unfortunately, your type of school district is almost at the bottom of the response rate and will have to be excluded from the analysis if people do not return on this mailing.

3. You may have already returned the questionnaire. If so, throw this away and smile about the time you saved.

4. If you have not returned it...PLEASE do so.

Thanks for your help!

Sincerely,

Abby Hughes

P.S. For your convenience, another questionnaire is enclosed. return address and postage are stamped on the back of the questionnaire. Just staple it and drop it in the mail!
### SCHOOL DISTRICT DOMAIN CATEGORIES

#### Range of Product/Population Served by Location/Services Rendered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Service Rendered</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ur-Up/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-Up/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-M/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-M/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-H/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-H/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-Up/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-Up/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-L/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-L/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-H/Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur-H/Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-Up/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-Up/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-M/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-M/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-H/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-H/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-Up/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-Up/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-L/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-L/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-H/Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru-H/Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-Up/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-Up/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-M/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-M/Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-L/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-L/Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-H/Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-H/Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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